DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA + + + + + ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL BOARD + + + + + MEETING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Protest

Administrative and Procedural Hearing Rulemakings and Technical (Status) Amendment Rulemaking

November 13, 2014

The Alcoholic Beverage Control Board met in Alcoholic Beverage Control Hearing Room, Reeves Building, 2000 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C., Chairperson Ruthanne Miller presiding.

PRESENT:

RUTHANNE MILLER, Chairperson NICK ALBERTI, Member HERMAN JONES, Member

MICHAEL SILVERSTEIN, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Mark Ruzzio, OAG

John Smith, Investigator, ABRA

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:55 a.m.)

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, good morning,
everyone. I want to welcome you to the
District of Columbia's Alcoholic Beverage
Control Board. Today is November 13, 2014.

My name's Ruthanne Miller. I'm the
chairperson. And to my far right is Mr. Nick
Alberti. And to my immediate right is Mr.
Hector Rodriguez.

MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Good morning.

CHAIR MILLER: To my immediate left is Mr. Mike Silverstein. Next to Mr. Silverstein is Mr. James Short. And next Mr. Short is Mr. Herman Jones. And we have six members in attendance this morning, and three

So we're here today for a public hearing on two rulemakings, administrative and procedural rulemakings and technical amendment rulemaking. Please be aware the proceedings will be recorded by a court reporter. And

members constitutes a quorum.

we're going to be calling you up in panels as this is a rulemaking proceeding.

We are here pursuant to DC Official Code 25-211(b) to conduct a public hearing and take comment on the two proposed rulemakings that make several amendments to Title 23 of the District of Columbia's municipal regulations.

The administrative and procedural rulemaking reorganizes Chapter 16 to bring clarity to the different types of hearings and the procedures related to those hearings.

Additionally, the rulemaking adds two new sections to address party standing and party dismissal as they relate to protest proceedings.

The second proposed rulemaking, the technical amendment rulemaking makes several changes to a number of chapters within Title 23 to conform to those corollary changes contained in the Omnibus Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Emergency Amendment Act of 2014.

Additionally, this rulemaking makes

other administrative changes not related to

the act. I will begin this hearing by calling

on those witnesses who notified the Agency in

advance regarding their desire to address the

Board.

Each witness will be granted five minutes to speak. The Board will then obtain comments from other interested parties who did not register in advance but who wish to be heard. If there's additional time at the hearing the Board may consider granting more time to individuals who have additional testimony.

If you have prepared written remarks please hand them to Ms. Danetta Walker, and she'll ensure they are properly filed. After the Board convenes this hearing today the record will remain open for interested parties to submit additional comments.

Okay, so I'm going to call up Panel

1	1, and that is Rod Woodson with Holland &
2	Knight, Paul Pascal with Pascal & Weiss, P.C.,
3	Risa Hirao, D.C. Association of Beverage
4	Alcohol Wholesalers, and Andrew Kline.
5	
6	MALE PARTICIPANT: We might need a
7	bigger table.
8	CHAIR MILLER: Oh, you can spread to
9	two.
10	MALE PARTICIPANT: Thank you so
11	much.
12	CHAIR MILLER: You can spread out,
13	those of you all
14	MALE PARTICIPANT: You're not used
15	to that one, are you?
16	CHAIR MILLER: No adversaries today.
17	MALE PARTICIPANT: I hope it doesn't
18	make you feel uncomfortable.
19	MALE PARTICIPANT: I've been
20	adversarial my whole career, so.
21	CHAIR MILLER: Okay, we don't we
22	I was going to say, why don't we start on our

1	far right with Mr. Kline if you're ready. If
2	you're not ready we can start with - or when
3	you're ready.
4	MR. KLINE: I am.
5	CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
6	MEMBER JONES: I'm sorry, I just
7	wanted to make sure - is there any rules, any
8	time limits, anything that you want to share
9	with them?
10	CHAIR MILLER: I think you missed
11	it.
12	MEMBER JONES: I missed it? Okay.
13	CHAIR MILLER: We did say five
14	minutes.
15	MEMBER JONES: Got it.
16	CHAIR MILLER: I don't seem to - I
17	don't have that clock right now here with,
18	that shows the five minutes but -
19	MEMBER JONES: I have -
20	CHAIR MILLER: You're going to be
21	keeping track?
22	MEMBER JONES: Yes.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MEMBER JONES: It'll - alarm will sound when your five minutes are up. Don't leave the room, just -

CHAIR MILLER: And I think what our procedure will be would be for each of the witnesses to present their testimony and then the Board will engage in asking you questions.

Okay. Are you ready?

MR. KLINE: Good morning,

Chairperson and all the members of the Board.

As you know, I'm Andrew Kline. I'm here on

behalf of Restaurant Association Metropolitan

Washington, RAMW. RAMW represents over 800

restaurants and restaurant service providers

in the D.C. Metropolitan area, including over

500 restaurants in the District of Columbia.

Almost all of our members are licensed by you for the sale and service of alcohol for on-premises consumption. These range from traditional white tablecloth restaurants to more casual eateries including

the trend towards fast-casual eateries that are obtaining alcoholic beverage licenses.

All of these establishments that are members of our association have in common a desire to serve and sell alcohol responsibly, in accordance with your rule and regulations. We applaud you for bringing forward the rulemaking and we generally support it. We have a few comments and a few concerns which I will discuss.

Probably one of our biggest concerns is the provision concerning cease and desist orders. There is an amendment to Section 8 which provides seven circumstances when the Board might issue cease and desist orders. We're not sure why this is necessary or why it came about. But I think it might be helpful to relate to the Board circumstances that we had with another agency, and that's the Department of Health.

For years, the Department of Health would close or interrupt service of an

establishment that had an expired business
license. Now to someone not involved in the
business community and not understanding
sometimes how difficult it can be to deal with
government, that may seem, well, you know,
what's the big deal, you have to have a
current business license.

But we found there were circumstances where there were mistakes. We had one member who sent off their renewal only to have it returned seven months later with an additional requirement, and then complied with that requirement and sent it off, didn't get their license and the Department of Health then closed them.

What we were finally able to convince the Department of Health was unless there's some imminent danger to the public, compliance with regulatory requirements that are more administrative in nature should not lead to a cease and desist. There should be appropriate penalties, obviously. If one

doesn't pay their fees on time late fees are certainly appropriate. And ultimately, if someone doesn't do what they're supposed to do, then the Board has the ability to revoke the license.

But we're very concerned about situation where they may be a knee-jerk cease and desist. My office deals with a number of licensees, as you know, and a number of businesses in the District. And it's not very difficult to find that your appropriation is not in good standing for one reason or another.

DCRA doesn't send notices to all of the businesses that are required to file the two-year reports. Now that's no excuse. You're still required to file the two-year report. But with all of the requirements and all of the things that we must do in running a business, we're concerned that we not just issue cease and desist orders in a situation where there's no imminent danger to the

public.

On your -- there were permissions concerning service of papers in contested proceedings. We just have a couple comments on that. We agree that email service is appropriate. We think it's the most efficient way to go. But if one compares it with the other methods of service that are listed in the regulations it doesn't rise to the same level. So we think there should be some precautions and some safeguards in place.

We think the best way to do this is when a party appears for the first time they fill out an entry of appearance form, they consent to service by electronic mail and that there by a common mailbox from which communications from the adjudications section would come.

Right now - I know, because I

appear before you - if I get something from

Janea Raines or Jonathan Burman or Martha

Jenkins or others within your agency I know

that my office needs to pay attention to that.

Our licensees and those in community

associations and ANCs, when you have a variety

of different names from which emails are

coming it can be a challenge, and it can be

confusing.

So we would suggest that you set up something like ABRAadjudications@dc.gov or something like that so that people are on notice when they come in and they say, oh, you're going to serve me by electronic mail. They know from what address to expect that communication. We just think that makes good common sense to make sure that everyone is clear from whom they will be receiving these important communications.

We also recommend that the initial formal pleading such as notices to show cause be served in the traditional manner, either by hand or by certified mail/return receipt requested.

Our concern is that ABRA staff or

others might go to a Web site, pull an address and serve it to that email address and it may not be one that's tended. It may be for reservations, it may be for some other function. So we just want to be clear at the start of the process that there's appropriate notice.

Lastly, I know I'm out time, just briefly, we're concerned about the provision that deems an application abandoned or withdrawn if documentation is not supplied within 45 days. Sometimes we don't get back it for 30 days into the process. So we think if they're going to be timeframes and there are going to be strict timeframes that there need to be timeframes for the Agency as well as for the applicants.

We have asked the Agency repeatedly, is there a date by which we should expect placards and notices in the DC Register from the date that we file our application.

And we've never gotten a promise as to what

that date is. So we think if there are going 1 2 to be timeframes, instead of putting only the burden on the applicants, there should be some 3 timeframe work for the Agency and the 4 applicants that all works together. 5 Thank you. That's all the comments 6 7 I have at this time. I did submit written testimony that may have some other points. 8 9 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. 10 MR. KLINE: I'm available for any 11 questions if you like. 12 CHAIR MILLER: Great. Thank you 13 Okay, we'll get back to you with very much. 14 questions. Mr. Woodson. 15 MR. WOODSON: Yes, good morning, 16 Chairman Miller and members of the Board. My name is Robert Woodson, and I'm a partner at 17 18 Holland & Knight, co-chair D.C. Practice 19 I've had the pleasure and honor of group. 20 serving as a member of this board as chair for about four years, some years ago. 21

But I appear before you today,

really, to talk about one thing particularly.

I've submitted written testimony that I think explains in detail what my remarks are about.

But in sum, it's about how to handle renewal process. I've appeared before the Board on several occasions in the last couple of months.

When how to handle evidentiary submissions in renewal has been, at least in my view, something of a issue. And I thought I would revisit that with you today. The problem that I saw is how to harmonize the relationship between Provisions 311, 313 and 315 of the code. Those are the provisions that deal with appropriateness and how to present evidentiary - how to move evidentiary submissions in support of whatever the proposition is.

And the challenge, to me, is that in the initial issuance of a license the appropriateness analysis begins, ad initium begins with a clean slate. And the Board

makes a decision regarding whether the issuance of the license is in conformance with the statute.

When that happens the Board has made a decision on the appropriateness of the license under 311. The issue becomes what is the nature of the evidentiary submission needed on a renewal. The provision of 313 specifically calls for the Board to look at additional considerations for renewals under 315. And the reason that was put in there is because the issuance of a renewal calls into question a retrospective review of the conduct of the licensee since it was actually issued.

The investigative report becomes a crucial piece of the Board's analysis. And in initial issuance of a license the investigative report give the Board a perspective on what the environment is like, the nature of the businesses to be and whether in their view the license can exist in that space.

It's the Board's decision on whether it's an appropriate action. But the investigative report is more of a survey of the environment in the renewal. The investigative report does something else. It does that but it also give the Board a review and analysis of the operational conduct of the business - what has been the nature of the business's violations, if any, what have been the operational features of the Board with periodic regulatory compliances and so on.

That's a much more - that is a very valuable tool when the Board considers whether the renewal of a license conforms with the statute. I would say that that investigative report could be, and often is, a crucial feature for the Board's review of the evidentiary submissions in a protest proceeding.

I took note that in the rules you have now called for the investigative reports to be matters of evidence irrespective of

whether a party actually moves the report into evidence. In a renewal proceeding I would offer that that was a very good thing to do.

The investigative report really is not a report from the parties. It is a function of the staff and the Board itself, and that should always be a part of the evidentiary record.

That said, what is the nature of the evidentiary submissions by the parties in renewals? Because the renewal, the central question in the renewal is what has happened from the time the license was issued to the time of this request for renewal? What has changed?

You've already made a decision that the existence of the license in that location, engaging in that kind of business, is appropriate under 313. Querying, is there something that has happened in the interim period that make, that calls into question that original doubt?

And so the use of the investigative report and the nature of what the protest is becomes more important. But for - now I would also note that both 311 and 315 have a presumption of correctness, absent there being a protest.

The presumption of correctness in 311 is qualitatively different because there the Board already has its investigative report which describes the environment and whether, as I said previously, whether the existence of the license in this place is appropriate.

In 315, though, the presumption is, there's a similar presumption but the presumption has a different flavor. The presumption there is that, unless something has happened in the interim, the license should continue in existence. Thus, what should the Board be looking to consider? What should the Board be looking to determine?

The determination that's of importance is what the objection is. So the

objection from the protestants become the starting point for the proceeding. The investigative report is always heard first. The parties then have an opportunity to come forward with evidence.

If, in a renewal protest, the applicant chooses not to come forward initially in the proceeding that is not a waiver. That is not in diminution of their ultimate burden of proof. Because the ultimate burden of proof is to be taken from the record as a whole, not on who the proponent of the particular fact is.

So, that said, I would say, and offer to the Board, that in protest proceedings it is clearly allowable for the protestant to open the proceeding because that narrows the subject of the discussion. That's the reason we have protest information forms, is to tell us what the argument is about and then for the Board to be able to structure its evidentiary record to answer those questions.

Requiring essentially a rerun of a 311 proceeding in a 315 renewal strikes me as being wasteful of the Board's resources and time. That's the essence of my remarks to you today. I'd be happy to discuss that in greater detail as the Board may wish.

I would also make one other recommendation and that is the Board's decision to have investigative reports become part of the record in the proceedings, irrespective of whether the move by a party is a good thing.

In renewals, particularly, I would request that investigative reports be made available at least ten days before the protest information form is required. Because the investigative report often changes the nature of the evidentiary submission desired to be made by the parties and, indeed, can be dispositive in any number of cases.

So I think that allowing the investigative report to be available to the

protestants or protest parties in advance, 1 2 particularly on renewals, would be very Thank you, Madame Chair. 3 helpful. CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, yes, and 4 we'll be back to you in a moment. Okay, Mr. 5 Pascal. 6 7 MR. PASCAL: Good morning. CHAIR MILLER: Good morning. 8 9 MR. PASCAL: I'm here today to represent the District of Columbia Association 10 of Beverage Alcohol Sellers. Risa Hirao, my 11 associate, actually will not be testifying, 12 13 but she's here to assist me if there's any questions. 14 15 As you know, the wholesalers are 16 dedicated to a safe environment for the sale and consumption of alcohol. And we're always 17 18 pleased to see that the Board is interested in 19 updating their regulations. 20 We have concerns - first of all. I incorporate in my remarks everything that 21

Mr. Kline and Mr. Woodson said because they

are issues also that I strongly believe in.

In the proposal, 23 DCMR 213.1

Exemption for Licensing Requirements you've created an exemption now for either host zone premises or the operator of the premises. I suspect what we think the word host and operator are sort of ambiguous.

CHAIR MILLER: What --

MR. PASCAL: And I guess our concern as a wholesaler is who can we sell to? Are we creating a new category that we can sell to these persons or not? Certainly, we're allowed to sell to consumers white wines and beer. As a general rule, we don't aim to sell to the consumers because we're in the wholesale trade. So this gives us some pause as to where the products would come from and the ability to trace the product.

CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry, could you repeat the provision you're referring to?

MR. PASCAL: 23 DCMR 213.1.

CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

MR. PASCAL: The category says, Exemption for Licensing Requirement.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. PASCAL: In terms of the timeframes, we've made some proposals that the protest may be or your application may be desist in 45 days or 15 days. Bear in mind that the applicants have, many times, made significant financial commitments. Many times they come in and try to do things very early because they know they're going to have protests or what have you. They want to get the license application in.

And we feel that the timeframes that you've set are really unreasonable, especially if you're dealing with anything that deals with licensing or some other issues where you're dependent on another agency. And this will come up later in another discussion.

Under Bottle Service, Chapter 7, that's 23 DCMR 7 21.1, this provision actually came about because of comments that I brought

to the Board's attention. You have some products like Grey Goose, which is a very expensive product, and some, especially the clubs and some of the other issues, bring out a bottle that's already uncapped and we believe that there was gray market product in those bottles, or it's not really Grey Goose in there.

So the provision here is that it has to be capped when brought to the table, which is what most wines are anyway when they're bought and opened at the table.

However, we think it needs to broadened.

You list as restaurants, taverns, nightclubs, hotel or multi-purpose facility but you fail to cove caterers and common carrier licenses. And caterers have the same issue, so we think you just need to expand the coverage to those additional parts of the license.

Now on the terms of the cease and desist orders that Mr. Kline was talking

about, in a sense, I generally support what you're trying to do. But on the other hand, you're overlooking the real world out there in terms of licensing.

I'll give you an example. Harris
Teeter merely changed its license, its
category from a corporation to an LLC. This
took months to get done because, first, they
had to go to get their occupancy permit
changed. And then there was issues dealing
with that.

Then they had to get their health inspections, and many times they were canceled, and then finally had to get the business license. That's the process. That could take a long time. And if we had these restraints - we filed the application to make this change, but it took months to accomplish because of other things. And they were technically and LLC. There could be issues there.

I had experience with the

corporation office. I'm a registered agent for numerous entities. Every time there's a renewal they send me their list. And we tried to go through their list with my list but many times they don't send me all the information for renewals.

And it's possible that something would slip by and an applicant may miss not or their license already and not know that they've been delisted. So there certainly should be some notice provisions and a right to hear on any of these issues that you've listed here.

And quarterly statements, you've now incorporated some words, sufficient documentation, to allow the Board to verify.

I'm not too certain what sufficient documentation is. Sufficient to me may be one thing, but to you it's another, so I think you need to - if you're going to use the word sufficient what you want to do, maybe you have to have a checklist of what you need for a

licensee to have available for you. But I'm a little concerned with the use of that word.

and finally, I don't necessarily understand the rationale is this party of dismissal where if the case is dismissed and then not reinstated, then they were asked for renewal, are you asking for \$1,000 fee for renewal? I don't understand the rationale.

I don't know whether you're trying to punish someone for not doing something or where this comes from.

There could be some rational reason it didn't happen, so it seems to be more punitive in nature, and I don't understand the Board's justification. With that, I'll close. And, like I say, I incorporated the gentleman's remarks before me. And I'll be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, thank you.

MS. HIRAO: Madame Chair, if there is time, I'd like to address two additional points in our Association's testimony if the

Board would permit. 1 2 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. MS. HIRAO: Okay, and this goes to 3 the exemption for licensing requirement. 4 mentioned that we had -5 MEMBER JONES: Just for the record, 6 7 I think everyone knows for sure who you are. MS. HIRAO: Oh, should I state my 8 9 name? MEMBER JONES: But if you could 10 11 just, since you're giving testimony, if you 12 could state your name. 13 MS. HIRAO: My name is Risa Hirao, H-I-R-A-O, associate counsel and vice 14 15 president for DC Association of Beverage Alcohol Wholesalers. 16 MEMBER JONES: Thank you. 17 18 MS. HIRAO: And the proposed rules 19 for 23 DCM 213.1, if a wholesaler is permitted 20 to sell to these, I guess some hosts that are exempt from the licensing requirement, I think 21 22 to protect the wholesaler from a potential

violation of 25-102(a), which is selling to an unlicensed party, perhaps maybe the Board can craft an affidavit for that party that's claiming the exemption to sign so as to protect the wholesaler. That's one primary concern.

And also, for bottle service, the way I kind of understand it is the bottle is brought to the table. And I'll throw a hypothetical to the Board to ponder on. What if there is a minor at the table? So the question is who would be serving the wine? Would it be the restaurant staff or would it be a person who's seated at the table?

And what if it is the person who's seated at the table and, by accident or intentionally, they serve the minor alcohol?

Would the actions of that customer extend to the retailer? So those are things maybe the Board can maybe fine tune in this bottle service rule. And I conclude my comments.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR MILLER: Great. Thank you. 1 2 Okay, so why don't we start with - since the topics are pretty different, why don't we 3 start with questions for Mr. Kline first and 4 then go to questions for Mr. Woodson and down? 5 Are there questions for Mr. Kline 6 7 from board members? I have a few. So with respect to the cease and desist orders 8 9 MR. KLINE: Yes. CHAIR MILLER: Okay, so I think that 10 your concern is that there are drastic actions 11 being taken, maybe, for an administrative 12 13 issue. 14 MR. KLINE: Yes. 15 CHAIR MILLER: Okay, so you 16 recognize there's at least a notice provided in the process? They don't just show up at 17 18 the door and close them down, right? MR. KLINE: Yes, but, particularly 19 20 in those sections that deal with other agencies, I mean, the - look at me. 21 22 competence of agencies in the District of

Columbia varies widely. And sometimes it's not so easy to get something resolved with a particular agency. And the agency may not even be correct. So I get concerned.

And I guess I wonder what the policy justification is for layering on. I mean, if the Agency - let's take the Health Department example. If DOH has issued a cease and desist with respect to sale of food products, why do we need another cease and desist? I mean, what's really the point?

With respect to the corporations issue, that's really a technical matter. And I dare say, and I hate to say this on the record but I will, I bet you that ten percent of licensees, their corporation is not in good standing. I mean, it gets caught on renewal and it gets fixed but corporations has not been notoriously excellent at making sure that people, you know, get notices and renew.

So, I mean, we just get concerned when we're dealing with other agencies. I

mean, I think the payment of fine issue and the payment to you is easy because we can resolve it amongst ourselves. We either paid or we didn't.

But I also think that the Board's current practice, which I also applaud, of including in show cause orders and have taken the practice of doing it on the record - hey, you don't pay by the deadline, you're going to get suspended. And I think that's a much better approach than just putting it in a regulation.

Because then we've, you know, it's in the order, we usually say it on the record and the licensee's very clear or should be very clear if they don't pay by the time they're going to get suspended rather than having a, you know, another provision in the regs.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, that's a good distinction to make. My other question goes to the regulation that's dealing with

applications which have inactivity and that there's a certain deadline by which they're deemed withdrawn or abandoned.

I understand that you raised the issue that there should be some parallel dates or corollary dates for agency actions, when they should be taken. But do you have an issue with putting some kind of finality with respect to applications that haven't been acted on or things like that?

MR. KLINE: I'm not sure that I fundamentally do, but I'm not sure that it needs to be a blanket rule. I don't - just like I don't sit where you sit, you don't sit where I sit. So I don't know what the problem is -

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm, okay.

MR. KLINE: - that we're trying to address here. So it's a little difficult for me to offer a solution when I'm not exactly sure, you know, how many applications languish. I mean, is this really a big

problem or is this, you know, somebody just thought it was a good idea? I don't know - maybe it is a big problem.

But from where I sit, I don't know that, so it's a little difficult for me. And maybe we should have a record in terms of on a lot of these issues, you know, what's the problem we're trying to address here.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. KLINE: Is there really a problem or did somebody just think it was a good idea. And good ideas are fine but, you know, as I've gotten older, I've found that less rules are probably better than more rules.

Because more rules are more things that, you know, don't get forced and don't get done. And, you know, there should be thought given to, well do we need this --

CHAIR MILLER: Sure. Sure, and -

MR. KLINE: - for a policy means.

CHAIR MILLER: There was, I'm sure

there was thought for every change. It just may not be on the record. Good point.

Would a notice provision make you more comfortable or not necessarily? For instance, you know, getting a notice that your application's going to be deemed withdrawn pursuant to this regulation unless you take action on it?

MR. KLINE: Yes, a notice always makes me more comfortable. And I think that, I mean, in real life what should happen is the examiner should say, hey, we X, Y and Z. Because, I mean, that's the issue. I mean, we do have issues at the applications phase in terms of getting information - what are you missing.

I mean, sometimes our office, we try to follow up and say, hey, we want to confirm that you have everything. And then the application doesn't get looked at until it gets to be the time we're saying we're ready to open, we need our license.

And then somebody decides to look 1 2 at and then they say, oh, we need A, B, C, D - it's like, well, where have you been 3 for six months? What haven't you told us this 4 earlier? So, I mean, we think this cuts both 5 6 ways. 7 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. MR. KLINE: And we look at the 8 9 Agency and say we need you to communicate with 10 us. CHAIR MILLER: Okay, good. 11 Are there other questions for Mr. Kline? 12 13 MEMBER JONES: Just real quick. CHAIR MILLER: Go ahead, Mr. Jones. 14 15 MEMBER JONES: You made a - during 16 your testimony you made reference to there should be a mutually binding time for feedback 17 18 in terms of we're expecting you to do 19

should be a mutually binding time for feedback in terms of we're expecting you to do something in a certain period of time, there should be a corresponding requirement that the Agency has to give you feedback regarding that same matter. Is that - did I capture - did

20

21

I hear that correctly? 1 2 MR. KLINE: Yes. MEMBER JONES: Okay. 3 MR. KLINE: What I'm saying is if 4 we're going to impose timeframes 5 MEMBER JONES: Yes. 6 7 - then they should be MR. KLINE: imposed all around. And we should be, just 8 9 like we're now - and it took an act of 10 counsel to do it 11 MEMBER JONES: Right. - we are now able to 12 MR. KLINE: 13 confidently tell applicants that, no matter how big the fight is, no matter how big the 14 15 issue is, on a new application you will have 16 a decision in seven months, okay? We're able to tell people that with confidence. 17 18 MEMBER JONES: Right. 19 MR. KLINE: The Board has been very 20 good about sticking to the statutory timelines. If someone says, when we file our 21 22 applications, when are we going to get our

placards, I can't tell them anything with much confidence at this point.

MEMBER JONES: Got it. Understood.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, any questions now for Mr. Kline? All right, how about for Mr. Woodson? Okay, I have a lot of questions for you, Mr. Woodson. And I do want to put on the record that Mr. Woodson did file a motion and protest case raising some of these same issues with respect to burden of proof and renewals, so we've certainly been thinking about that issue.

I guess the first one I want to ask
you is your recommendation a change in
procedure than what's in the regulations. And
I'm wondering if you had thoughts about that
when you were chair of this board and had
renewals. Did you ever have renewals before
you?

MR. WOODSON: Actually, I did have a thought about that. There have been some

incremental changes in how the Board handles renewals at the staff level since my time, a few years ago now.

The most important change has been the usefulness of your investigative reports.

Our investigative reports, during the time I was chairman, had a lot to be desired. They were often incomplete, more often than not.

There wasn't any consistency with the way the reports were prepared and the reports often were not timely at all.

If we got written reports, 90 percent of the time, I would have been thrilled. We usually got oral reports throughout the course of the hearing. And so the standardization and the usefulness of the investigative reports has changed a lot, at least in my thinking, about what protests or renewals will call for.

Because at that time, absent having some real information about the licensee and his operation, we had to hear all of that

again in an affirmative way. So the improvement in the investigative reports has gone a long way.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So basically,

I mean, one of my questions is, procedurally,
how this would work. I mean, you talked about
going first with this report, which we do
anyway. But then what would change would be,
as I understand it, the protestants would go
next and set forth what they see the issues
are with respect to peace, order, quiet or
appropriateness in general.

And then the applicant would respond to that, which sounds efficient. But how would that work with respect to any party having rebuttal? You know, normally the application goes first and then the protestant goes second and applicant gets rebuttal.

Do you see that there would no longer have that normal contested case setup and it would just be investigator/protestant/applicant? Have you

thought that through?

MR. WOODSON: I've been thinking about it, frankly. Since I wrote this testimony that was a point that I started to consider, the value of rebuttal testimony.

Actually, it's, in a practical sense, I don't see it being all that different. While the ultimate burden of proof remains on an applicant, what you're really looking to do is to develop an evidentiary record on 313 issues.

And if there isn't - if the protestant begins first and the applicant responds with rebuttal and affirmative testimony, then I don't really see the challenge in allowing the protesters to have another shot. I mean, were talking about being fair.

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MR. WOODSON: And so I don't really have a problem with that. What I'm trying to encourage is the - and that is narrowing the

scope of the proceeding to really the problem at hand.

We have - the hearing that you spoke about, Chairman Miller, took a very long time. But that's not the first time they've taken a long time. In my own experience during, when I was on that of the desk, I had 12-hour hearings and 11-hour hearings. And it became a burden for everyone, particularly for you all who volunteer of your time.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Interesting.

MR. WOODSON: If, by looking at renewal proceedings as narrowed to what the protest issues are, I think you save everyone time and energy and heartburn. The protestants will know what it is that we are talking about. The applicant will know what it is that they have to address, the Board will know what it has to decide.

So whether rebuttals should be permitted by the protestant, I leave that at the Board's discretion. I don't think that

it's a problem. And oftentimes then, in a 1 2 measure of fairness, it might be appropriate, to borrow a phrase. 3 CHAIR MILLER: So, I mean, I don't 4 know if these are exact fits under traditional 5 APA but would you say that in that case, then, 6 7 the protestants become the proponents? MR. WOODSON: Well, they become the 8 9 proponents in the sense that they propose the 10 issues. It's not that they become 11 proponent under the APA really goes to the idea of who carries the ultimate burden of 12 13 persuasion, and that still remains. CHAIR MILLER: Right. 14 15 MR. WOODSON: The issue, the focal 16 point I'm encouraging is what is the issue that we're talking about. If there were no 17 18 protests there would be no issues. 19 CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm. 20 MR. WOODSON: If there no protests either in a 311 or 315 proceeding there 21 22 wouldn't be any issues. But in a 315

proceeding, particularly - particularly,
there, you're talking about what are the
operational problems that have arisen from the
beginning of the license period?

Why should the Board concern itself with everything else if the investigator - and this brings us back to the investigative report - if the investigative report reveals enough information for the Board to assess the operation or compliance of the licensee then a full-blow 311 proceeding from the applicant seems to be duplicative.

MR. KLINE: If I may add on to that? I mean, I think the point is this - we can talk about legal burdens and we can talk about what's a law and everything else, but from a practical standpoint, when we come into this room what you want to know about is why the protestants don't want the license renewed, what are the specific issues that relate to that.

Whereas the licensing scheme, obviously,

contemplates a lot more, and I think what Mr. Woodson is saying is let's focus on the issues at hand. If the protestants have an issue with noise, for example, then, you know, why are we talking about parking?

I think, practically, the Board has done that. I mean, I think that, because from a practical standpoint, we're not going to be talking about parking if nobody has an issue with parking. So I think we're there. It's just a question of, procedurally, might there be a better way to do it.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And,

procedurally, it would be still a little bit

different if - and we've heard this in some

cases where the applicant says I'm just going

to do rebuttal. So that's what changes. Do

you think it's still a better procedure to

have the expectation or the ordering of the

protestants to go first, in general?

MR. WOODSON: I think the Board ought to leave its options open, frankly. I

don't think that it's necessary to make a hard and fast rule that the applicant must go first in every kind of proceeding because, again, the objective of the Board is to develop its evidentiary record.

If the applicant chooses to use rebuttal to provide its evidentiary record, that does not obviate its obligation to be able to provide persuasive evidence on the record as a whole.

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MR. WOODSON: I made a point in my testimony that the standard for substantial evidence is taken from the record as a whole, and it doesn't matter who presents it. If the protestant provides testimony in its proceeding that actually substantiates everything that the applicant would want, why argue about that?

If, by -- in parallel, if the investigative report has the same effect, why say it again?

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm. Okav. 1 2 MR. WOODSON: If I might --CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 3 MR. WOODSON: - Chairman Miller. 4 CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm. 5 MR. WOODSON: I might also say that 6 7 I didn't come down here to reargue the case that we had a couple of months ago, but it 8 9 just highlighted to me an issue that I thought is worth revisiting with the Board. 10 CHAIR MILLER: No, I think it's an 11 interesting point that - we've got a lot of 12 13 people in here and if anybody else would want to address it that would be good because, 14 15 personally, I think these hearings do take an 16 awfully long time and I don't, you know, know why it should take six hours for some of these 17 18 hearings. 19 And if there's a way that we can 20 make them more efficient, you know, I'd be open to that. So, okay, I don't suppose you 21

know of any other regulatory bodies that have

a similar type of ajudicatory system?

MR. WOODSON: I really haven't done
that kind of survey.

MR. WOODSON: I've tried to address the issues that you all face. And primarily it is being able to streamline a renewal protest because that seems to gather a lot of interest in the community.

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, Mr. Alberti.

MEMBER ALBERTI: I sort of want to ask - I'm really confused by what I'm hearing as your perception of what your burden is in a renewal because - and maybe you can clarify what you believe your burden is because if you look at the process as a whole you start with, usually there's some discussion before between the parties. And if there isn't there is mediation.

So you start with mediation and the parties have sat down and if they're honest brokers they have discussed some of the

issues. Then you have, before you, you have the investigative report. And always in the investigative report, one of the things that the investigators do is they interview the parties to find out what are the issues. And that's very helpful to us so we have some idea of what we're focusing on as we're going into the hearing.

So you seem to be saying to me that your perception is that you have to cover all your bases - you know, parking if that's not an issue and the property values, if that's not an issue and, you know, trash if that's not an issue.

But I don't understand why you have that perception when you have before you the ability to know what the issues are. So am I missing what your perception of your duties are here, what you need to bring forth?

MR. WOODSON: The importance of the
- the investigative report had become a
crucial thing in renewals, much more so, I

believe, than in reg 313, Initial License and Proceedings.

The investigative reports are not really, have not been as timely available for other things. One of the reasons I suggested the investigative report be completed at least with some time certain before the protest hearing date - or not the protest but the submission of the protest information form.

One of the reasons is for that very purpose because the parties don't - the investigative - let me put it another way.

The investigative report is sort of a third party, not involved in merits, not - it's a statement of what is going on without bias.

That's the value of that.

Those reports have a material impact on the way the parties address one another in pretrial discussions. If the investigative report does not reveal anything that gives support to the protestant's argument then what is the protestant argument

about?

And those kinds of things do serve to narrow the issues. But I'm also mindful that often protests protest everything. It's not - it is the sophisticated protestant's that narrow the issues.

But often the protest language is all three standards.

MR. WOODSON: Yeah.

MEMBER ALBERTI: And so, but what is really at issue is trash removal. What is really at issue is parking some fashion. But wind up having to argue about everything.

What is the value of that?

So, yes, the pretrial, the prehearing activity serves to narrow things. But then, sometimes they don't. And with that said, I do think that the Board improves its ability to control the record, to control the development of its evidentiary submissions by allowing different procedures, a different

type of proceeding given the case at hand.

MR. PASCAL: Well, would you advocate like for a pretrial procedure so that the issues would be narrowed? Because you're remiss in your duty as an applicant or as a licensee's attorney if you don't do all of those. You know, they're going to do a shotgun and raise a protest and everything but, ultimately, when they come on their side they may only focus on one. But if you haven't covered everything, you don't know, necessarily, what they're going to come out with in their testimony.

MR. WOODSON: Well, I have a response to that. When you shotgun the issues but you don't provide an evidentiary support for those issues, shotgun, I don't think those issues are worthy of the Board's consideration. And I would move to dismiss them.

Because the purpose of the proceeding is to discuss the issues at hand.

If it's not an issue, if there's been no

testimony or evidentiary submission on them, 1 2 why are we spending time in the record on them? 3 CHAIR MILLER: Let me - oh, go 4 are you finished with - when you're finished 5 6 7 MR. WOODSON: I am. I am finished. CHAIR MILLER: Oh, okay. 8 So I 9 oh, could I just follow up on this a bit? 10 know, I think part of our new rules also 11 references 12 MR. WOODSON: I'm sorry, Chairman, 13 I can't CHAIR MILLER: Part of our new 14 15 rules, I believe, references the protest information forms and exhibit forms that we've 16 been developing this year and expanding on 17 18 somewhat for requirements, that issues and witnesses and exhibits be identified. Do you 19 20 all have a comment with respect to whether that has been helpful, is helpful to preparing 21

for the hearing?

MR. WOODSON: Yes, particularly if you get it in time.

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm, okay.

MR. WOOD: Yes, as I noted, they have great value. But they have less value when they don't arrive in a timely manner. receiving the investigative report at or at the time the protest information form is filed or after really doesn't help us.

CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Silverstein?

MR. SILVERSTEIN: Yeah, I think

this is a critical issue. And it also involves the question, how do we use our staff. We have, at any time, between 15 and 20 investigators. They work until 4 o'clock in the morning at times. They're handling thins, often, that are far more important

If there has been an incident or something that involves an eminent

threat to public safety or something of that

21 sort.

this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22 The question is how much work we can force them to do and at what point in time it is best to do these things. It would be certainly convenient to the parties if these reports were done 17 days prior to a protest hearing.

It would make life easier. It would focus the protest hearing. But how man protest are, in fact, dropped in that 17 days because both parties look at the deadline, and they've got the gun to their head and they say, we're not going to deal or bargain three weeks, four weeks out and wait.

And then we have the staff working on these excellent reports that are sometimes 40 and 50 pages in length with, you know, pictures and circles and arrows and all of that stuff. And you find that they're not needed. How do we reconcile this? And if we don't have these done 17 days in advance is there some way that we can make some minor change to the PIF, to allow you to submit evidence based on what was in the report that

you haven't seen yet?

I know I'm all over the board on this, Rob, but you know where I'm going from.

MR. WOODSON: Yeah, I do. Well, first, there's no clean tradeoff. If you choose one path, there are followings on that path. If you choose another path you may fall into the pit.

MR. SILVERSTEIN: Agreed.

MR. WOODSON: There's always a challenge on either way. That said, the point you raised about the value of your staff time is something I appreciate completely. There is - it might be - it may be - it may be that some sort of preliminary investigative report would be helpful, some form of preliminary investigative findings before the full-blown report is provided to the Board's record.

I leave that to your good judgment.

But that would certainly help the parties

because what I'm trying to - the objective

I'm trying to achieve here is for the Board's hearing time to be compressed. And at the end of the day I have to ask who's time, in your mind, is most valuable on a relative scale, right, if you will?

I would say that your time here is extremely valuable and that the problems that we have are we have so much work and so little time. So I don't see being able to compress the amount of work that has to be achieved. So let's compress the amount of time that it takes to do it.

MR. SILVERSTEIN: Mm-hmm. So would it be possible to add something to your PIF that, say, we reserve the right to bring witnesses to discuss or rebut the findings in the investigative report that we have not yet seen or something to that effect?

MR. WOODSON: Well, certainly, if I were counsel at a proceeding like that I would have to say that, that if we receive the investigative report after the time of

submission of the PIF, that I would want to 1 2 have some opportunity to address the issues in the investigative report. 3 That's always an exigency that we 4 have to deal with. But in the normal course 5 of events, why do that? That, to me, is an 6 7 extraordinary relief rather than a regular source of relief. 8 9 MR. SILVERSTEIN: Thank you. 10 MR. WOODSON: Sure. 11 MR. KLINE: Let me state 12 CHAIR MILLER: Yes, go ahead. 13 MR. KLINE: - what I think is the In terms of the times of the obvious. 14 15 hearings -- the Board may not like this 16 get 90 minutes, they get 90 minutes. The only people that don't have a time limit 17 18 CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm. 19 MR. KLINE: - are you guys. So, like the counsel and like other bodies, you 20 may wish to consider that in question rounds 21 22 there be time limits among board members.

mean, you know, the 90 minutes is the 90 minutes. And only I've come, gone over it or come close to it once.

But the hearings stretch out much longer that three hours. And it's not us because Jones over there is really good with his little stopwatch. My two cents, for what it's worth.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, Mr. Alberti.

MR. ALBERTI: I just want to sort of sum up, what I'm hearing, what you're saying, Mr. Woodson - Mr. Kline, and everybody's saying is that you'd like some mechanism, some way of knowing, as you come to the hearing, what the issues are and more specifically than you sometimes do now.

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MEMBER ALBERTI: And I would say that would be beneficial to the Board also. So I think that's what you're really grasping at here is to know what your target is when you come to the hearing more than you do now.

Am I correct?

MR. WOODSON: I would say, yes. I would say if I had to make a straight out about a simple straight - the short answer is yes. I'm always one that pays attention to how the record is developed because that's where the decision is.

And there are occasions when frankly, there are occasions - I agree with
my colleague, Andrew Kline, about the time the
Board takes in asking questions.

On the other hand -- on the other hand, I think there's a great value in that because the Board often asks the questions that needed to be asked and that the parties miss. And so I'm reluctant to jut say, don't - you know, you've got two minutes, and that's the end of that. I'm reluctant to do that.

I would also add that having allowed, having the Board ask questions the way they do, I believe, enhances confidence in

the decision making process that what you do 1 2 with the things you ask, the questions you seek answers for, can give confidence that 3 those who are before you are actually being 4 That's particularly true for the 5 heard. protestants. 6 7 MEMBER ALBERTI: Yeah. MR. WOODSON: So be - have a 8 9 clock, but be willing to let it go. 10 (Simultaneously speaking) 11 MR. KLINE: Can I respond to that? 12 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. 13 MR. KLINE: I was somewhat the When I first pioneer on notice of issues. 14 15 walked into this business and I walked into 16 these rooms, I had no idea what the other side was going to throw at us so I screamed, we 17 need notice of issues. It's due process. 18 19 need notice of issues - many years ago. 20 The result of that was a provision in the statute that says when you file a 21

protest you have to state the grounds.

what do we get? We get -

CHAIR MILLER: Statutory

MR. KLINE: - a statutory

recitation of peace, order and quiet. And so, you know, I didn't feel like I got very far.

I think what the Board has done in terms of the PIFs and the other efforts that have been made with an investigative report in advance went much further than was the result of my screaming at the counsel and your predecessors that we need notices of issues.

Because, I mean, the requiring parties, I mean, they're going to recite as little as they need to, particularly in the early stages, when they may not have formulated what their issues are.

But I do think what you have done, as I said, getting the investigative reports before the hearing because you're right, and there was a time when we didn't see investigative reports. We'd walk in here and we had to prepare for everything because we

didn't know what was going to be in front of us.

MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Yes, one of the concerns that I have is the number of witnesses that we have. At one hearing, and I moved to the Board, but I remember being here until one o'clock in the morning.

Now we heard every witness but there were an awful lot of witnesses and, you know, I'd like to see if you can provide some insight on this, some guidance on this because we want to hear everybody, but there are so many witnesses. And sometimes they say the same thing.

MR. WOODSON: Yes. I was here. I must say that when I had that, Chairman
Miller's chair, I was very persnickety about that. And that's everyone has a different style of approach.

But the rules of evidence are that you don't hear evidence that's irrelevant,

immaterial or unduly repetitious. And the unduly repetitious end of it tends to be where the problem is.

You can have ten witnesses to say
basically the same thing that two can. So why
hear ten? But, now having said that though,
I think there's also this amorphous idea of
fairness.

MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Right.

MR. WOODSON: And that comes into play all of the time in these kind of proceedings. And so while you may improve your record, while you may narrow all of the time necessary, if the price to be paid, if the cost that's incurred is a lack of confidence in decision making and willingness to be fair, then it may be better to err on the side of more, more testimony.

But overall, it might be useful to have some ground rules around that to say, right in the front of the hearing if we have if you have ten witnesses with you to talk

about these issues then we don't want to hear the same thing from more than two. So choose the two you want to speak, have speak. That kind of thing may help.

But I do appreciate your point about repetitious testimony. It tends to reoccur all the time.

> MEMBER SHORT: Excuse me.

CHAIR MILLER: Yes, Mr. Short.

MEMBER SHORT: Just to make a comment, I'd just like to throw up due process. You get citizens that come here who've been waiting for six or seven months to talk about issues that are affecting their quality of life.

And then they get here and then they are told, well, there's a time limit so you waited six months but you won't be able to testify tonight, although you have taken off from work or although you've done some things to alter your life style.

And hearing case after case, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think the process that the citizens and also the businesses would like to have is just due process. So I think it'd be hard for a chairman to say I don't want to hear what you have to say after you sit here for five or six hours.

And so there's a thin line. Where do we draw the line with due process versus let's get the hearing over with faster?

MR. WOODSON: I appreciate that point, Mr. Short. That's why my remark was at the beginning of the proceeding be straight out about it. You will know who the witnesses are from the protest information sheet.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay.

MR. WOODSON: And you will know basically what they're supposed to say. So if there are ten people listed on the sheet to say the same thing then why not, at the beginning of the proceeding make that known so that they don't waste their time.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay, can I address

that?

MR. WOODSON: Sure, sir.

MEMBER SHORT: Let's say we have ten people that live on the same street at different addresses. Someone in Address 1 might not hear the same thing as Address 3. Someone at Address 5 might not hear the same thing as but they have the same issue. So how do you know until they testimony, even after going through the PIF and all that information we have at hand?

And things might have changed between the time you had the PIF and you had the hearing. Let me say, in due process, is a person takes time off from their busy schedule, business person has to close the business down to be here, citizens have to take time off from work or have a babysitter for his children.

Where does that line that we draw do we simply say, this is it. Okay, we're going to hear this many people today and

that's it. We're going to that's going to be the hearing.

The person then, as the citizen, says my government's not listening to me or the business person might say I didn't get a chance to really say everything I want to say. Due process says we hear everybody out. I think that's I understand is due process.

CHAIR MILLER: I think that there are different ways of approaching this. I mean, lately we've been approaching it or have been approaching it as letting people know they can adopt another person's testimony or say I agree basically with what they're saying except for this point, you know, to try to streamline it.

But I have one other question and we never have this dialogue. So while you're here, and then we'll hear from people on the other side with the protestants.

I'm just kind of also looking for tools, like, for instance, if the PIF has been

helpful would it be another step if -- and I think applicant could do this more than the protestants, but like a pre-hearing statement, this is what we're going to show and blahblah. It's like a little road map.

And then, you know, we have that focus and know what to expect. I think it's probably more balanced if both sides can do something. But I'm wary about putting too much burdens on the citizens. But I just wanted to throw what out as an idea.

I think it's to everybody's interest if the hearings don't go on for six hours. If they're really a little bit less and more focused, and primarily focused on the issues that matter to people that don't get lost in all the peripheral. So that's -- are there any other tools you think of or can address?

MR. PASCAL: I'm not here as often as certainly Mr. Kline and some of the others but in my early years of trial work, you know,

pre-hearing statements to try to define issues or pre -- were very helpful to really focus on the issue.

And that's why I brought the issue up because, again, many times the applicant of the licensee has to be prepared for everything that may come at them.

CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MR. PASCAL: Yet, after you hear the hearing it may only be a couple issues that were really the serious issues. So anything to define the issues, I think, would be great.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, we'll get --

adjudication, even though a law describes contested cases as trial type hearings, that

point to that, to look at the proceeding and

really isn't the objective to have a trial in a judicial sense.

While I like the idea of the prehearing, pre-trial submission, as a lawyer, I

like that kind of stuff. It doesn't often sit well on the other side of the table.

CHAIR MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MR. WOODSON: Because, you know, we are practiced at the art of arguing on paper.

CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MR. WOODSON: Most of the citizenry is not. They are practiced at the art of talking to you about it. And that may be more valuable. Or maybe the value of that conversation could be diminished, if you will, with this pre-trial statement idea, although I like it, as a lawyer.

But I would say though that the mediation is something we haven't explored, maybe could be explored again. The mediator could have a role here to help. You know, classic mediation is you convene the parties, the parties talk and then the mediator helps the conversation.

I have found that the conversation in the mediation is often advanced when the

mediator can give some text, some contour, 1 2 some color, to whether the issues that are being presented make sense. 3 That's an informal kind of thing. 4 But perhaps some -- I think you all 5 understand what I mean -- but something to 6 7 help the Board see what these issues truly are. 8 9 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: I think Mr. 10 Jones has some --11 CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Jones? Mr. Silverstein? 12 13 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: I want to echo what Mr. Short said but go beyond that. 14 15 People sometimes take off -- often take off 16 from work, arrange their schedules, are here for a 4:30 hearing that doesn't begin until 17 18 7:30 and doesn't end until 1:00 in the 19 morning. 20 Or they take off to come to a hearing that ends up being canceled because 21 22 the first hearing has gone so far that we

can't do the second, that our inability to get 1 2 things done on a reasonable schedule to balance the need to hear evidence with the 3 need to move things forward has been a problem 4 that is one from which all of us suffer. 5 I would ask if you have any ideas 6 7 on how we can, beyond -- and I think this was an excellent idea, that we should consider 8 9 somehow limiting ourselves or at least trying 10 to put a goal on that. I don't think that if something is important that we should stop 11 ourselves from exploring it. 12 13 But would it be of any value to limit that 90 minutes to 60, to 75? Would 14 15 that be a bad idea, necessarily on each side? 16 MR. KLINE: I'm going to address that. I think --17 18 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: How do we do 19 two hearings a day without cheapening the 20 process? Right. 21 MR. KLINE: I'd be

concerned about going less than 90. And I

think in terms of hearing nine witnesses, if someone can put on nine witnesses in 90 minutes and cross, God bless them. I mean, I wouldn't have thought of that.

And I'm sympathetic to the comments
I've heard about, you know, people come down
here and they want to be heard and they want
their chance. I think the time limit is
probably the fairest way to do it. It gives
the quarter back on each side the ability to
make a decision as to who they're going to put
on.

And if people don't get on they can be mad at their quarter back instead of mad at you or mad at me because decisions have to be made about time. I mean, I come back to -- and I agree with what Mr. Woodson says about the importance of the Board's questioning because I have found it extremely valuable in many cases that I've tried here.

But I will say that every other body, and their roles are as important as

yours, have some sort of time limit. And if
the questions are important then it would seem
that the board members could fit those within
the time limit.

I don't see the process as broken as perhaps the record that I've heard this morning. I think things are working pretty well.

MEMBER SHORT: Amen.

MR. KLINE: Curious to hear from those that are here as protestants as to what they think. But, I mean, I think it's pretty good. I think it could be tighter in terms of time. I know all of you spend a tremendous amount of time down here, and I respect it. You pay attention. No one's sleeping on the desk. All of you are engaged. I know, from our side, we appreciate that.

I don't always agree with them but you make reasonable decisions. And I think that's all we can ask for.

MR. WOODSON: I would --

CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

MR. WOODSON: Let me join in that remark. The proceedings before the Board are really very good. And even in the time that I began engaging with all of this in the late 90s, it has gone light years ahead.

So right now what you're trying to do is -- and what is being done here, is to refine the edges. But the core is good, but to refine the edges.

I would raise one other thing, that this issue has come and gone -- or not -- this solution has arisen, gone away, come back, gone away. And that is the size of the Board.

CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MR. WOODSON: There's a perennial problem with the workload that you all have to address. And the challenges that come, the parties participate through the parties and proceedings who have to deal with the Board and its work load.

So some years ago I was involved with a

discussion about enhancing the size of the Board to 11 and dividing the Board in half so that that the proceedings could all be handled in a more timely manner, that it would take less time to get to a protest.

It would take less time for the individual members of the body to have to spend with the work at hand. You know, there was a group of people who really liked that idea and there was another group that didn't like that idea, but all of which really were gathered around this notion of how do you allocate your time and how time is allocated to the work at hand.

I don't know if there's any -there is not perfect solution because if there
was we'd have found it by now. So, I guess,
what to I say? We're still a work in progress
and we're trying to manage the irritation.

MR. PASCAL: I would certainly concur that I think the hearing before the Board today, for me as a practitioner, has

been a lot better than it was in the past. 1 2 Years ago I suffered through one case that took about four months because we'd 3 put it on a couple hours, then we'd have to 4 come back and it was just a nightmare. And my 5 client was saying what's going on up in the 6 7 District of Columbia? So it's, clearly, much better now. 8 9 I thought that there was a provision in the 10 law that you could operate with panels and I'm 11 not --Operate with what? 12 CHAIR MILLER: 13 MR. PASCAL: Panels. CHAIR MILLER: 14 Oh. 15 MR. PASCAL: I think there's a --16 as I understood it, in March the 7th was a provision a the law that you could operate in 17 18 panels of three. And I've often wondered why

MR. WOODSON: I would say, to join in that remark, that change came during my

that never was put into effect because that

certainly would streamline things a lot.

19

20

21

tenure as chair. And the idea that panels of 1 2 three are interesting, we found or I found that there were some internal challenges in 3 dealing with that. 4 If you have a panel of three, then is 5 that a final decision? And if it's not a 6 7 final decision then how do you deal with that? That just adds another level of adjudication, 8 9 if you will, to it. That was one. And then the other is what panel is 10 11 to hear what, when and to what extent does participation on a panel also obviate your 12 13 need to appear together has a whole. So you could wind up having, instead of one day of 14 15 hearings, you could have three or two per 16 person. 17 MEMBER SHORT: To get the same 18 information?

MR. WOODSON: Pardon?

MEMBER SHORT: To hear the same

information?

MR. WOODSON: Yes, I think it's,

again, the same information or to get 1 2 something else. But the point is you'd have to come down to a proceeding more than once a 3 week. 4 So --MR. PASCAL: How about a second 5 boardroom? 6 7 MR. WOODSON: Oh, I don't know. That would just get --8 9 CHAIR MILLER: All right, I think 10 we're getting off track. But thank you. 11 Thank you very much. Madame Chair? 12 MEMBER JONES: 13 CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Jones? 14 MEMBER JONES: I just -- so I was 15 very interested and I was kind of sitting 16 back and listening to the dialogue. And we're talking about how we want to try and focus the 17 18 nature of the hearings when we have protest 19 hearings. So we try and get understanding of 20 what the subject matter is and staying true to that subject matter. 21 22 But in our own dialogue and

discussion, based on what you originally presented, Mr. Woodson, and where we started which was a slight change in terms of the order of procedure, not even the burden of proof but really the order of procedure, we've gone to changing the size of the Board, creating different panels, just far afield of where we were.

So even in our best efforts in regulating ourselves in this process, we haven't been doing a good job of it in this process as we stand here today. So I'm going to help myself with this process and just and make sure I'm clearly understanding what you proposed originally.

In what you proposed, where is the time savings in the procedural elements forr what you proposed? And I'll say it, what I think it is and you tell me where I'm wrong.

The only time savings that I see is that you, if you're representing a licensee, you do not have to put on a case justifying

why you meet all of the points of every possible scenario that you could be challenged or your client could be challenged on.

You only have to present evidence to defend the voracity of your client's ability to meet the letters of the law or exceed them as per the specific items that are being raised as issues by the Protestant group. So, for example, if the protestant group says, I only have an issue with noise, then that's the only think that you have to present your case on.

So you could have witnesses that speak to trash, that speak to security, that speak to the safety, but you only have to put on your one witness about noise to defend your client's ability to be in compliance with being a good neighbor when it comes to noise emanating from his establishment. Is that what you sere saying originally in your proposal?

MR. WOODSON: Yes, and yes.

1	MEMBER JONES: Okay.
2	MR. WOODSON: If I might?
3	MEMBER JONES: Feel free.
4	MR. WOODSON: Yes to narrowing the
5	number of issues that a licensee of licensee
6	in renewal has to present.
7	But also yes that the issue beyond
8	the issues in the protest become irrelevant as
9	a matter of law because if the investigative
10	report does not provide evidentiary foundation
11	to call into question the operational
12	characteristics beyond the protest issue, if
13	it doesn't do then the only issue at hand in
14	the proceeding is the trash, if you will.
15	And so a full-blown evidentiary
16	presentation on everything else is irrelevant
17	as a matter of law, not simply as a matter of
18	fact or yes, not simply as a matter of
19	fact.
20	So in effect, the answer is yes and
21	yes.
22	MEMBER JONES: Got it. Thank you.

CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Woodson, let me just follow up on that because this was an important point. I believe that your answer is yes to that because if there were other issues as to appropriateness the investigator would raise them.

MR. WOODSON: That is one of the values that your investigative report has provided to all of us. But more importantly, it's provided it to you. It's helped us understand what is of concern with compliance but it is most important to the Board to give context and understanding of what really is before them.

CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Alberti?

MEMBER ALBERTI: Mr. Woodson, you said -- I'm sorry, but Mr. Woodson said earlier -- it struck me -- that you, as legal practitioners are skilled in making arguments, written arguments and that the protestants may not be. They probably, in most cases, are more skilled about, in talking about the

issues.

So when I look at one of the most important parts -- well, not -- one of the important parts of these protest information, the protest reports is the interviews with the protestants and with the applicant because you've got people talking and it reveals, really, what the issues are. I find them very helpful.

The rest of the report I find helpful but sometimes you have to read between the lines. Sometimes the investigator is missing things because they're just presenting facts, all right.

And you have to look at the big picture. You have to put all the facts together. So it is evidentiary evidence, all right. But it may not tell the whole story. And you as a representative of the applicant may interpret it.

So you've get to present evidence. I see the applicant having to present evidence

relative to what's in the report. So those 1 2 are my comments, but what I would like to ask is how useful do you find the interviews that 3 you see in these reports? Is that useful to 4 5 you? MR. WOODSON: It depends on the 6 7 case, the type of procedure. Where the procedure's a protest they tend to be more 8 9 interesting because you also have the 10 opportunity for direct contact with the 11 protestants. And so that happens in formal 12 13 discussions. It happens in mediation and so It's less so in show cause proceedings --14 on. 15 MEMBER ALBERTI: But we're talking 16 about protests. We're talking --17 MR. WOODSON: You asked me broadly. 18 MEMBER ALBERTI: Right, I realize 19 -- I'm just focusing on the protest thing. 20 That's what we're focusing here. MR. WOODSON: I'm not sure how to 21 22 -- I really am not sure how to respond to

that. I give great credence to the investigative report because facts really do matter. And that's what evidence it. It's a presentation of fact, not opinion.

And so, if an example, the argument in the protest is that there's too much noise but the facts reveal that there have been any number of noise analysis. There's been attention from the noise task force and the investigator finds that there's been compliance with the law, then what difference does it make what someone's opinion is about noise?

It's not what you think. It's what you prove. And in these kinds of proceeding the investigative report, I think, serves a great purpose for us in being able to narrow down what it is we're talking about. I hope that I've responded to that.

MEMBER ALBERTI: Yes, but, I mean,
I guess my point was, you know, that the
investigative report might -- the investigator

may go out and find a noise issue one night out of all the nights that are out there, all right.

Now that's a piece of evidence but you, as the applicant, I would assume would want to put that in context with evidence.

MR. WOODSON: Absolutely.

MEMBER ALBERTI: So my point is you keep implying that the report somehow stands alone as evidentiary piece of evidence. But it has to be flushed out by the applicant.

MR. WOODSON: Well my only
rejoinder to that, Mr. Alberti, is if the
investigative report's conclusion is there's
regulatory compliance what else is there to
flush out?

Because the factual argument from the applicant would be we're in regulatory compliance. So is it necessary to do that?

On the other hand, if the investigative report says there is non-compliance and it's a non-compliance for this and non-compliance for

1	that, then of course the applicant must come
2	forward and either rebut that or provide some
3	other contextual perspective on that.
4	MEMBER ALBERTI: Thanks.
5	MR. WOODSON: On those issues, if
6	you will.
7	MEMBER ALBERTI: Okay.
8	CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Jones? Okay,
9	are we wrapping this up, Mr. Jones, so we can
10	
11	MEMBER JONES: No.
12	CHAIR MILLER: No?
13	MEMBER JONES: I have a question.
14	CHAIR MILLER: No, okay. I know
15	you have a question. Go ahead.
16	MEMBER JONES: When you speak of
17	compliance is this compliance in the form of
18	a compliance with the regulations, i.e., if
19	you're not in compliance you receive a
20	violation of some sort?
21	Or were you speaking of compliance
22	in some other meaning of the word?

MR. WOODSON: Please say that again 1 2 to me, Mr. Jones. In your response to 3 MEMBER JONES: Member Alberti you used the words compliance 4 when referring to the investigator and his 5 putting together an investigative report 6 7 related to a protest hearing. MR. WOODSON: Yes. 8 9 MEMBER JONES: You mentioned compliance. 10 11 MR. WOODSON: Yes. And you said if the 12 MEMBER JONES: 13 investigator doesn't find that there are any compliance issues then what is there to talk 14 about. But if he does or she does find a 15 16 compliance issue then there is something to talk about, and that's what we'll focus on. 17 18 Did I misunderstand your response to board member Alberti? 19 20 MR. WOODSON: No, you did. You understood that. 21 22 MEMBER JONES: Okay, so when you

said compliance in that sense what meaning of 1 2 the word were you using? Were you saying it in the sense of compliance/non-compliance? 3 Fine/no fine or violation/no violation sense 4 of the word? 5 MR. WOODSON: Well the 6 7 investigative report, if it concludes there is regulatory compliance that is affirmatively 8 9 stated in the report. 10 MEMBER JONES: Correct. 11 MR. WOODSON: Then what is the value in enhancing the record to prove 12 13 compliance again? MEMBER JONES: So in terms of a 14 15 protest hearing are there issues that are 16 relative to a protest hearing that wouldn't result in a non-compliance violation? 17 18 MR. WOODSON: Well, that's the 19 allegation that you get from protestants. In 20 the, for purposes of the investigative report and its -- and it is evidence. The 21

investigative report says one thing.

22

If the

protestants say something else to that then let's talk about that.

But it becomes a question of what the protestants put forward about non-compliance that becomes the subject of discussion or the issue in the proceeding because the investigative report stands as an independent piece evidence that there is compliance on that issue.

So what does the protestant have to say to rebut that? By contrast or the flip side of that is if the investigative report says there is non-compliance and the applicant's evidentiary submission does not address that the same infirmity applies, the same problem portends because you have not provided an evidentiary submission to rebut the claim of non-compliance by the investigator on the other side of the coin.

So it works on both ends.

MR. KLINE: Perhaps I'm seated at the wrong table for this one, but I think the

investigative report goes to appropriateness, which goes beyond issues of compliance.

I mean, compliance is your enforcement, regulatory matter. And I'll be the first one to concede that your decision in the appropriateness context would be complete compliance but there's still possibility of a finding of appropriateness.

So I'm not sure I completely agree.

I mean, I think the investigator could raise other issues with respect to its appropriateness. So, yes, they're compliant with regulations but there's a noise disturbance, you know, there are the issues that fall under the appropriate.

MEMBER JONES: Okay. So thank you, so to both of your points. My struggle was trying to understand and -- because that's -- I'm more in line with what Mr. Kline, in terms of I, as an individual board member, view a protest hearing versus a regulatory type of hearing for a violation of some sort.

So when you used the word 1 2 compliance it struck a chord with me from that standpoint. But that being said, I understand 3 where both of you are coming from and I'll 4 leave it at that. Thank you. 5 CHAIR MILLER: Good, okay. 6 7 MEMBER SHORT: Okay. CHAIR MILLER: All right. 8 9 Madame Chair? MEMBER SHORT: 10 CHAIR MILLER: Oh, Mr. Short. I'm 11 sorry, go ahead. MEMBER SHORT: Just my thought on 12 13 this. The investigative report says the investigator went out three nights out of two 14 15 months -- one o'clock, 12 o'clock, maybe 10 16 But the protestants are saying it's o'clock. 3 o'clock in the morning every day that they 17 18 hear this, every Friday and Saturday night. 19 So now you have a report that says 20 I didn't find any problem. And now if you tell the protestants they can't testify to 21

what they've heard at 3 o'clock in the morning

when the investigator wasn't there, then 1 2 that's not due process. That's the only point I'm trying to make. 3 MR. WOODSON: Yes, to that, Mr. 4 Short, I would say then the record needs to 5 expound on that because if the investigative 6 7 report has that scenario but the protestants talk about something that happened outside of 8 9 that scenario then we need to hear about that. 10 That's -- that becomes the subject of the discussion. 11 CHAIR MILLER: 12 Okay? 13 MEMBER SHORT: Thank you very much. Thank you. 14 MR. KLINE: 15 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. This has 16 been a good dialogue. MR. WOODSON: Thank you for the 17 18 time. MR. KLINE: 19 Thank you very much. 20 Very informative. Thank you so 21 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: 22 much.

1	CHAIR MILLER: Okay, I'm going to
2	call the next panel. Abigail Nichols, D.C.
3	Night Life Noise Coalition, Milton Grossman,
4	Denis James, Kalorama Citizens Association.
5	(Off microphone discussion)
6	MS. NICHOLS: I have written
7	testimony but it's not for any
8	CHAIR MILLER: I see that. I guess
9	I could just start with you.
10	(Off microphone discussion)
11	MEMBER ALBERTI: Did you call
12	Milton Grossman or
13	CHAIR MILLER: Yes. I did. Yes, I
14	did.
15	(Off microphone comments)
16	CHAIR MILLER: Ms. Nichols? Ms.
17	Nichols, did you have copies for the Board?
18	MS. NICHOLS: Yes.
19	MEMBER ALBERTI: I think she's given
20	them to Martha already.
21	CHAIR MILLER: Oh, okay. Thank
22	you.

1	MS. NICHOLS: But I'm going to can
2	that in what I say.
3	CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
4	MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: That'll be
5	much appreciated.
6	MR. KLINE: She's going to what?
7	MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: Can it. I
8	think she's going to condense it.
9	MEMBER ALBERTI: Condense it? Oh,
10	after this discussion.
11	(Off microphone conversations)
12	CHAIR MILLER: Okay, I'm going to
13	mix up the order here a little bit if you
14	don't mind and don't ask me why.
15	But okay, I would like it if MR.
16	James could go first and then Ms. Nichols and
17	then Mr. Grossman. So you have to pay
18	attention, yes. Okay.
19	MR. JAMES: Thank you for that.
20	CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
21	MR. JAMES: Ms. Jenkins has my
22	written testimony and it does not include the

remarks that I wish to make about what I just listened to.

CHAIR MILLER: Yes, sure. We're very interested in that.

MR. JAMES: So I think I will write some additional comments and get them in by the end of the day.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. JAMES: From one who sat here through some very long hearings, not some of you longest I think but some pretty good ones. I do appreciate the desire to streamline the process, make it better, cover all the ground that's necessary.

But one thing I do know, I can understand why the Board likes the investigative reports that it gets and I do agree with it. They're much better than in past years. The raw information is certainly helpful. It helps you locate the establishment in the neighborhood, photographs, the maps that show all the other establishments, the

listing of the establishments.

But then when you get down to the number of visits and no problem found for establishments that, every time I walk by them I'm seeing a problem. Maybe it's late at night. Maybe the investigator's not there that particular time.

It feels like prejudicing a jury against the case that we're trying to put forth. I'm not damning the whole investigative report. I'm trying to be fair to what I heard. And there's useful information for us in there as well.

And we can cite, obviously, during the hearing see, oh, well there's the investigative history and that includes certain reports and those have record of different violations that have been assessed, and that's something the Board should take into consideration.

But for the investigator to truly know if there's a noise problem, the fact that

the Board -- and let's just say for an 1 2 establishment, for any given establishment there's no noise problem noticed by the 3 investigator. 4 Well, the investigator is quite 5 honestly not competent to judge some of those 6 7 violations because the ABC code does allow the D.C. Noise Control Act with decibel meters to 8 9 be used. And your investigators are not 10 competent in the use of those. So, you know, 11 that's just one little --12 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: Say that 13 again, sir? I didn't hear that. 14 MR. JAMES: Sorry, your 15 investigators are not competent in the use of 16 decibel meters. I mean, they can become They're not trained in it, to my 17 competent. 18 understanding. So, but just, like it's a 19 prejudice against the case that the community 20 is trying to make sometimes. I'm not saying, I'm not trying to 21 22 paint with a hugely broad brush, just an

observation that I'd like to make based on that long discussion.

So to get to my written testimony, the pub crawl section, I think it's a good idea to have a license created. But I don't think you go far enough. If you're going to call it a license, well, should it be protestable?

It seems that would be fair because I know that in other communities there's a lot of pub crawls. And if that were going on in my community I would want the ability to effect it. As you know from many of our settlement agreements, in Adams Morgan we have provisions that say no pub crawls? It's not universal but it's very close to that.

And it has protected us against some really bad behavior that -- that's what we used to have there. So it wasn't based on just like, oh, we don't want those, that sounds nasty. We did experience them.

So -- and I understand that it's,

the idea is to be able to better control them because the Board doesn't see that it has authority. So, but if you're going to have authority then you need some penalties to assess, and I don't think there are any penalties to assess. Maybe there are general ones.

But it seems like there are some that could be gleaned from the regulations on pub crawls that are in existence that you could put into the civil penalty section.

And then the timing problem. The old 712.1 says that the organizer must file an application six weeks prior to the event. Bu the new 712.1 foresees the ability to get a potential pub crawl licensee license and still be able to submit and application for Board approval for the licensee's first event just 30 days in advance.

That doesn't seem like enough time and particularly if the Board should agree with this idea that it become a protestable

license. Also I think taking this step is probably going to sort of give sanction to a little mini-industry that kind of already does exist. But it'll become something more like, oh, that's something you can do. I think I'll create a business that's just about that and nothing but that.

that could have great affect on different communities. I know that downtown parts of Dupont Circle have many pub crawls because whenever there is one listed I tend to inquire if I can't tell where they're listed, just to make sure that Adams Morgan establishments, though they said they won't, are not participating.

So that's my thoughts on the pub crawl. There's references in 1602.5 and 1612.2 to protest petitions. And I'm pretty sure that this refers to the old protest process by which the objectors could go around and essentially get a vote of the neighbors,

within the prescribed distance, 600 feet,

1,200 feet and present that to the Board as

sort of like a vote against an establishment

or a request.

And I just think that that protest petitions is antique language that didn't get repealed when that Section of 25601 was repealed earlier. And those were Sections -- I'm not sure which ones, but 25603 through 25608 have been repealed. I'm pretty sure that that's what that is in relation to.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. JAMES: There might be other reasons to get to petitions, but I don't think they're protest petitions. Because if the point is to have people qualify for protests, in the language of 1602.5, in addition to or instead of filing a protest, it seems like it's all about becoming a protestant.

And that was one way this petition was in a certain area. There were very divisive things, you know, neighbor against

neighbor. They were generally considered very unpleasant types of protests that everyone agreed would be for it to be a good idea for it to go away at the time.

So then the 1612.2, no, I'm sorry.

That's the same, same item. Moving to the

1605, Party standing of a group of five or

more residents or property owners.

I think the Board's suggestion for what that should contain is too limiting. And I suggest changes which I show underneath the Board's initial paragraph at the top of Page 2. There are parts of the code which give further explanation. And I think regulations are meant to flush out the code.

So I think that would be reasonable to include the information that a moratorium zone only requires three persons with like grounds for their protest in that part. And I'd rather use the word shall be granted standing instead of will. And state the requisite number which would either be five or

three or more. 1 2 So that would be my suggestion there in that section. And it's to, just to 3 make it clear and more straightforward that 4 there are two standards for how many people 5 take to make up a group. 6 7 Then the part that I -- the proposed reg that it gives me the most 8 9 heartburn is that 1605.3, a group of five or more individuals will be defined by the 10 11 members -- Pardon? CHAIR MILLER: I said that's the 12 13 five minutes. Do you want to wrap up? MR. JAMES: 14 Gosh. 15 CHAIR MILLER: So I know we spent a 16 lot of time with the other witnesses, but we 17 were --18 MR. JAMES: Sure. Yeah, well, this 19 is just my last point and it's --20 CHAIR MILLER: Okay, that's fine. 21 You can wrap it up. 22 MR. JAMES: And I will be wrapping up.

CHAIR MILLER: That's fine.

MR. JAMES: Absolutely. So the group of five or more individuals will be defined by the members set forth in the protest petition. In other words, it's a closed group in the Board's eyes. And it's closed upon sending in the protest letter.

And it just doesn't seem the reality of life. There's a 45-day protest period. What if somebody returns from an out of town trip, a business trip and they come home on the last day of the protest period and they file off a good letter.

And there's nothing the matter with it any other way. It's timely. But they can't join that party, that group of five that was created or group of seven or whatever number it happens to be.

People should be able to come here to the roll call. And it's fine to have preformed groups but if there's one or two or three stragglers they just don't -- people

don't know everybody. It's a dense, urban 1 2 environment in Adams Morgan and there's many, there's hundreds of people within large 3 apartment buildings around establishments. 4 So I just think that that's too 5 exclusive and takes, I'm not sure if -- due 6 7 process -- away from those individuals. don't think the Board should be taking that 8 9 sort of action. You should not take actions 10 that suppress participation. 11 CHAIR MILLER: Okay, so it you wrap 12 it up --13 MR. JAMES: That's it. CHAIR MILLER: I think I'd like to 14 15 get a look at that. I think I'd certainly 16 want to get back to that point when we do the questioning. 17 18 MR. JAMES: Thank you. 19 CHAIR MILLER: And I want to say, 20 Mr. Rodriguez had to go testimony at a counsel hearing and he'll be back if he can. I know 21 22 he wanted to hear you all and we ended up

spending a lot of time on that first panel.

So I know he'll certainly read the transcript if he doesn't get back for the rest of the hearing. Okay, Ms. Naples.

MS. NAPLES: Chairman Miller, members of the Board, I'm very glad to be here to testify. I'm also very glad to be hear to listen because this is the first time I've ever participated in a regulatory proceeding of any kind. I mean, you've seen me a lot on protests.

And so I came with not understanding how structured this could be or unstructured because one of the things as I read the regulations, I was very concerned about what isn't there. But if I'm correct, was Mr. Woodson talking to issues that are not in the proposed regulations? I'm talking about suggestions for changing the hearing process.

For me that issue was noise regulation. We've been working for a year

with the Agency on noise problems and feel that there's so much that could be done in regulations and we don't see anything there.

And we'll be submitting something separately about that.

Another one of my ideas was, oh, I
wish this were a forum so I could better
understand why you were proposing what you
were proposing or that there had been an
upfront statement of where the various changes
came from, a side by side -- you know, what's
cleaning it up, where the laws changed, where
we've noticed these problems and then -- but
a forum would then allow that back and forth.

And it did appear you were having a very good back and forth with Mr. Woodson on his ideas about hearings. And, you may recall, I was at that hearing and I have a lot of ideas about it too. And I was very interested in what he said and think that there's something there.

Because, to respond to Mr. Short's

comment, the residents didn't get to speak at that hearing because of various procedural matters. In part, they ran out of time. I never got to talk. I sat through the whole thing.

I talked like rush.

One resident had to leave because she had set aside so much time, but she had an elderly person to go do some important birthday with. And, maybe putting the resident's case up front would allow for that.

In terms of repetitive testimony, residents often feel their concerns minimized.

Oh, that's a crank. And so I try to bring -I got 105 signatures on my first petition to try to overcome that feeling on our part.

Okay, so when, based on what's going on so far, I would suggest a hearing on the subject of hearings conducted as a forum. Perhaps a separate hearing on noise regulation. Something, a statement from you all, more about why you're doing.

Mr. James picked up on pub crawls. I started picking up on things and then I thought, I'm going to submit that separately. There's not going to be time in five minutes. And I just also wanted to say that as I looked at the timeframe from resident point of view, three weeks today from the publication of the notice, for residents to even notice there's a reg out there, to study it and do some kind of an analysis.

And the last thing is to show if
there are any support for the comments. I'm
just talking for myself. I haven't had a
chance, barely, to show my comments to my
partner in D.C. Night Life. So with that, I
really support the Shaw Dupont Citizens
Association who I think has submitted written
testimony but aren't here today because of how
much they manage to do in three weeks.

So and the last thing would be don't rush to final rules because, as a newbie to the regulatory process, your statement that

you plan to publish final rules in not less than 30 days, I thought, well what's the point of a hearing? They can't do anything with a hearing and publish rules. But maybe that's not -- Mr. Woodson was explaining that maybe isn't what that means in that phrase.

And I won't say anymore. Oh,
except to say I'm willing to help with
regulatory improvement. I mean, that's it.
I'm seven years into this now as a resident.
And I just characterize myself as stubborn and
put an awful lot of time into this, and I'd
sure like it to be less.

CHAIR MILLER: Well, we really appreciate you coming down and having this dialogue with us. We'll get back to you. All right, Mr. Grossman.

MR. GROSSMAN: Members of the Board, my name is Milton Grossman. I'm a longtime member of the District of Columbia Bar and a longtime resident of the Glover Parks Community.

Over the past couple of decades I have represented the RANC, our citizen's association, and many individual residents and businesses as protestants in these ABC Board proceedings. But this morning I am here solely speaking for myself.

It is obvious that the Board has given a lot of consideration to the changes which are needed in the procedural rules based on the recent changes in the statute and its accumulated experience in dealing with proceedings before the Board.

So it was extremely disappointing to me to find that the Board totally failed to deal with a provision of the existing procedural rules which is markedly at variance with the underlying statute and which indeed severely undercuts participant rights guaranteed by that statute.

And I'm referring to the provision of Code Section 1605.2 which states all protests shall be in writing and shall be

received by the Board by the end of the protest period and shall state as grounds for the protest why the matter being objected to is inappropriate under one or more of the appropriateness standards, et cetera.

In other words, the Board and staff
now takes the position that if a protest fails
to state one of the appropriateness grounds as
a basis for the protest it is out of here. It
will not be recognized as a protest that meets
the requirements of the statute.

This position cannot be sustained by any reading of the underlying statute.

Section 25.601 sets forth the standards to file a protest against a license.

CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry --

MR. GROSSMAN: Nothing in that section in any way indicates that it is necessary to make an appropriateness objection in order to have a valid ground for protest.

I invite the Board to look at Section 25.301, the general qualifications for

all applicants. And I think it is not without
significance that the very first requirements
stated as a general requirement for all
applicants is that the applicant be of good
character and generally fit for the
responsibilities of lessons of licensure.

Yet if a protestant were to file a protest based solely upon a concern that the applicant is not generally fit to meet the requirements of licensure it would be thrown out on one's ears. Not a protest that meets the requirement of Section 16.105.2.

This is a problem that needs to be addressed by the Board. Nothing in the statute, nothing in any of the decisions of the D.C. Court of Appeals lends the slightest support for the notion that the only basis for an objection to a license is an appropriateness objection.

Now in the Glover Park Community we have been particularly concerned about the fitness of our, one of our nude dancing

establishments to meet the requirements of

licensure. And yet we were not allowed to

present those objections to the Board. And

indeed an application for reconsideration

without rejection is still pending before the

Board after many months.

And I think it is notable that while this proceeding is still pending before the Board we learned not too long ago that the person that put up all the money for the acquisition of this license has plead guilty in the District Court of Maryland to drug trafficking charges and that the U.S. Attorney is now seeking the forfeiture of that license as a product of the drug trafficking.

And this is something that an exploration of in an ABC Board proceeding would have been very enlightening. So I'm urging the Board to get rid of the language in Section 1605 that limits protests to appropriateness grounds.

Now I might add that this makes

good sense as a matter of Board housekeeping. 1 2 It is very, very easy to throw out the catch words noise, parking, defacto peace, order and 3 quiet and be in the proceeding. 4 And indeed there's some indication 5 that if you do that you can slide under the 6 7 door a concern about fitness. This makes no sense whatever. There's no reason to force a 8 9 protestant to raise a concern that was not at 10 the heart of this real problem in order to 11 raise the concern that really is. So I urge 12 the Board to make those changes. 13 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. Okay, questions for -- we're going to start with Mr. 14 15 James since he was first? Anybody have any 16 questions for Mr. James? 17 MEMBER SHORT: Yes, I have. 18 CHAIR MILLER: Yes, Mr. Short. 19 MEMBER SHORT: Mr. James, thank you 20 for coming out this morning. You made a statement about the readiness of the 21 22 investigators to coming out about the

registered noise. 1 2 Are you familiar with the new Noise Task Force? MR. JAMES: 3 Yes. MEMBER SHORT: Now can tell me what 4 you know about the new task force? 5 I read about it. MR. JAMES: 6 Т 7 understand that it's made up of different agencies and DRCA's included, and they do have 8 9 decibel meters at their disposal. MEMBER SHORT: That doesn't meet 10 your qualifications of being well trained and 11 -- you said due diligence when it comes to 12 13 noise inspections? MR. JAMES: Well, I don't believe 14 that the task force is involved in the routine 15 16 creation of the investigative reports for protest hearings for one thing. 17 It seems to 18 me that's one ABRA investigator is assigned to 19 And the many visits that are listed -that. 20 MEMBER SHORT: We -- sorry, okay, 21 go ahead. 22 MR. JAMES: So I've seen maybe a

dozen to 20 or 30 visits listed of 1 2 establishments at various times. And it's usually the investigator, him or herself, 3 saying I went there at these times, on the 4 stand, sworn. 5 And to my knowledge the task force 6 7 is not involved in that. That might be a good move to sometimes include them. 8 9 MEMBER SHORT: Would you like to -so duly noted. Thank you, Madame Chair for 10 11 that. Thank you, sir. CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Alberti. 12 MEMBER ALBERTI: Mr. James, thank 13 you for coming. I just, real quickly, I want 14 15 to thank you for paying such close attention 16 to these regulations. And especially noting, I think, our proficiency in 1605.2. 17 18 certainly need to address the groups of three there. And I missed that and I thank you for 19 20 pointing that out. Thank you. MR. JAMES: Glad to hear that. 21

Thank you.

CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Jones. 1 2 MEMBER JONES: I just want to thank you for that. I missed that as well, so I 3 apologize. 4 5 MR. JAMES: Okay, great. CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I know I 6 7 wanted to get back to you on the deadline for protestants to join a party of five. And what 8 9 do you -- do you have a proposal? There needs 10 to be some deadline. Would you agree there 11 needs to be some finality, some deadline as to whether --12 13 MR. JAMES: It's already in the It's 45 days for a protest period. And 14 law. 15 because I don't happen to know those three or 16 five people across the way and that they filed 17 a protest --18 CHAIR MILLER: So are you saying 19 that it's in the statute that it's 45 days and 20 that this regulation shortens that period? MR. JAMES: I don't think it does 21

But, I mean, one could imply that it

do that.

does do that in a way, based on my example. Ι 1 2 mean, my example was exaggerated, say, the But it's a day that you can file a 3 last day. protest. 4 CHAIR MILLER: So you're saying if 5 you have 45 days to file a protest -- just so 6 7 I make sure I understand you correctly. not looking at the regulations right this 8 9 second. Say you had a party of five made up 10 of 15 people right now and you filed it within 11 30 days. And then 10 days later somebody else 12 13 wants to join it, these regulations disallow that? 14 15 MR. JAMES: Yes, I believe they do. 16 CHAIR MILLER: And that's your concern, that they should allow it until the 17 18 45th day? 19 MR. JAMES: Correct. 20 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, but actually 21 MR. JAMES: 22 until you get through roll call what you will

now call roll call but what is called the 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

administrative review, in a change in these regs, you don't know until you get there. mean, how do you know? Did you go and knock on 100 doors around your neighbor to find out if someone else has protested, and is there a group that I could join?

I mean, it does say group in the code. It says a Group of Five. doesn't say pre-formed group of five.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay, so what you're saying is parties ought to be able to form a group at the roll call because that's where they meet other people that might have similar interests. That's what you're proposing?

MR. JAMES: Yes, and that has been the practice. You know, I sometimes argued to the Board's agent in these cases. But if there's somebody who just showed up we have no objection to them joining this pre-formed group, you know, that organized themselves at some point.

So I think that's definitely, it's 1 2 not relayed out in the code, but it's not prohibited in the code. And the code -- I 3 think, again, the word pre-formed. 4 CHAIR MILLER: So, right, this is 5 your proposal? 6 7 MR. JAMES: I think the Board's proposal would prevent it. So I would say 8 9 don't be --10 CHAIR MILLER: Do you think its 11 allowed right now based on the statute? Is that what you're saying? 12 13 MR. JAMES: Yes, I definitely think it's allowed. And it's happened many times in 14 15 cases that I've been involved with for a long 16 time. I mean, that used to be where you 17 18 met your fellow protestants. This part I'm 19 hazy on but the group of five, I think that 20 came into being in the year 2004, that language in 25.601. 21 Before that it was different 22

1	language but it was, I think it was more
2	loose. And this was a bit of a restriction
3	CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
4	MR. JAMES: to tighten it. But
5	
6	CHAIR MILLER: So is your view the
7	mediator should be able to make the decision
8	about joining groups and putting people into
9	groups? Is that your position?
10	MR. JAMES: You can't change it.
11	Yes. CHAIR MILLER: Because?
12	MR. JAMES: It's not the mediator.
13	I understand that the person that does that
14	role now is the Board's mediator.
15	CHAIR MILLER: That's what I mean,
16	that person, at roll call.
17	MR. JAMES: So I think it would be
18	better to spell it out than to have it be
19	gray. I'd be glad to put, to write a
20	suggestion. I just was objecting to what the
21	Board's proposal is that seems to say that a
22	group of five or more individuals will be

defined by the members set forth in the protest, that seems to change. It's a closed circle. That's who we are.

And I just don't understand why that would -- I mean, these are the kind of things that happen is that you might lose a protestant. Somebody might move between the filing of the protest and the actual protest hearing.

And the other side can say, oh, they're not a group of five anymore. So let's have those who are affected is my only point. I'm not saying fake it so there's a whole bunch more. I'm saying just let those who have come forward with a protest letter filed timely, with the proper grounds cited, that's common to the others be invited to join that group.

I'd be very surprised if people rejected their neighbors who were concerned about an establishment. Say, oh, no, we don't want that person to join.

CHAIR MILLER: Okay. All right.

MR. JAMES: And I don't see how it would really hurt the Board. Let's just say it's a group of five and one more person is added. I don't see how that negatively affects the Board's activities.

CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. Okay.

All right, I was wondering if you just have an idea about protestants going ahead of the applicant in the protest hearing.

MR. JAMES: I think the code

clearly states that the burden of proof is on

the applicant to show that they are

appropriate. I think that would be a

departure from the code. The Board can write

regs but not the code so I think that's a

subject that would deserve much more attention

in a Council hearing perhaps.

But it's like given the associated changes to the PIF and the exhibits there's an awful lot of information being exchanged between the parties, so they do know what each

other are going to be presenting. 1 2 CHAIR MILLER: Right. And if you've got good 3 MR. JAMES: evidence then we hope -- let's say, at the 4 protestants' side which is the side that I'm 5 on occasionally, had good evidence. One, you 6 7 hope that it would be heard and accepted. the other side would have to essentially rebut 8 9 But I don't see any particular savings in 10 changing the order. 11 Okay, and yes, CHAIR MILLER: 12 actually I thought that you had some concerns 13 about exhibit forms and stuff, but are you getting, exhibit forms, you're pretty much 14 15 onboard with them? 16 MR. JAMES: Well, I ran out of I would have probably written something 17 time. 18 about that. I will still do that, but --19 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. 20 Just to touch on it, MR. JAMES: you give the ability for I think it's for 21 22 showing a finding, but I guess that takes

place during the hearing. Like if a protestant comes forward with something that wasn't listed, exhibits, part of the PIF, and upon examination the Board said, oh, that's fine, that can be allowed. That is a bit of an out there.

I do have this concern that,
generally speaking, we're volunteers. ANC
commissioners are volunteers in their
communities. People on civic associations and
the individuals are all -- I think they're all
generally trying to make their neighborhoods
better.

So we're not professionals. We don't particularly want to go to protest hearings, so therefore we develop our evidence late often because the reality comes that, yeah, you're actually going to have to go to a hearing.

So it's just hard the last week or two before a hearing to make sure you can develop the necessary evidence. And some of

it is quite benign, like photographs or perhaps video or something of that nature.

It's something that anybody could witness at any time.

So it just seems unnecessarily harsh to have to have it that far in advance when it's something that is just anything that anybody can see in the public unless, you know, that's not a universal statement, but --

CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. JAMES: -- photographs that help the Board understand what's going on or photographs that show something that, an expansion of premise, say, that we didn't know had happened and then all of a sudden we realized, oh, that's never been licensed or something.

I'm just trying to think of things that could be beneficial to a protestant case.

And I might try to suggest some softening of that part because I do understand the Board wants it to be more professional in a sort of

1	even-Steven kind of
2	MEMBER ALBERTI: Mr. James, I
3	really appreciate this but I think
4	CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
5	MEMBER ALBERTI: I'm kind of losing
6	the focus here, so
7	CHAIR MILLER: Right, okay.
8	MEMBER ALBERTI: What I would
9	suggest is maybe you kind of write something
10	to the Board
11	MR. JAMES: Sure.
L2	MEMBER ALBERTI: because I'm not
13	really and I know you're talking off, just
L4	off the top of your head.
15	CHAIR MILLER: Right. And I asked
16	the question. I'm sorry.
L7	MEMBER ALBERTI: And that's
18	difficult. I understand. So I think it would
19	be better if you submitted comments. And I'll
20	get it more concisely then. Thank you.
21	CHAIR MILLER: Okay, I just wanted
	to say that, and we can move on because that

isn't specific to the rules. And I just
wanted to kind of check where you were. But I
don't say we're looking for something more
professional. I just say we're looking for
parties to be on notice of what the issues are
with those cases. Yes?

MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: Mr. James, I think that we heard what Ms. Nichols had to say about sometimes people being here until early hours of the morning or giving great amounts of their own time. You're talking about volunteers. But the other side's paying a lot of money and the other side has often their lives involved and their fortunes involved in this.

So this is -- both sides have a lot at stake. One of the things that Mr. Woodson was talking about, I want to know how this would impact you, is if the licensee were to say at this point we're fine with the protest report and we will reserve our comments for the rebuttal and we would like the protestants

to talk about specifically what their problems 1 2 are first so that we don't deal with parking if they don't think parking's an issue, so 3 that we don't deal with what the community, 4 how we're providing charity to the community 5 if that's not an issue. 6 7 Do you have a problem with that, where the licensee would simply say we're 8 9 going to sit on the protest report, we're 10 going to let that speak for us and then we'll 11 rebut whatever else? 12 MR. JAMES: I do. I have a very 13 big problem with it because the protest report is white bread, quite honestly. No offense. 14 15 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: Okay, it never 16 -- that's why I'm asking. MR. JAMES: It never finds a 17 18 problem. I'm not trying to be insulting but it needs to straddle that line. It can't be -19 20 - it can't make our case for us unless --MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: Now wait a 21 22 minute, I'm saying they're going to go without

-- then you go and say what your problems are 1 2 and then they come back and rebut or address what you say those problems are. 3 Why should the Board MR. JAMES: 4 create a document using its agents, paid for 5 by tax payer money, to have a document that 6 7 refutes our protest? MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: So you think 8 9 that the current system is fine? MR. JAMES: I know it's there. 10 And I said earlier the value of the Board to 11 familiarize yourself with the surroundings, 12 13 that's good. The many visits are still troubling to me because I walk my neighborhood 14 15 different times and I see things. And they're 16 never reflected. They're just never reflected in those visits. 17 18 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: It doesn't 19 have in there the investigative history of the 20 It doesn't have in there the place? violations? It doesn't have in there those 21 22 types of things?

1	MR. JAMES: It does. It doesn't
2	have the reports. It has the listing on them.
3	Now I'm assuming the Board knows the cases but
4	I mean you cover so much ground with so many
5	different establishments throughout the city
6	over time that I'm not sure you can just
7	because it's listed as part of the
8	investigative history that you know, oh, yeah,
9	Establishment X, that had the three knifings
LO	in the three-year period.
11	I just don't know that you know
L2	that. Now if we wanted to talk about it we've
13	got the investigator there. We can ask them
L4	those questions. But
15	MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: We're talking
16	passed each other.
L7	MR. JAMES: I don't know.
18	MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: I think we
19	are. MR. JAMES: Maybe. I always feel
20	like this is
21	MEMBER ALBERTI: Mr. James, really,
22	I think Mr. Silverstein's what he wanted

from you was the process. I don't think he 1 2 was discussing how well we do in protest reports. I think he was discussing how 3 they're used. 4 MR. JAMES: 5 Right. MEMBER ALBERTI: And that's what I 6 7 think you want to direct your comments on. MR. JAMES: Well, I guess that's 8 9 where I'll still fall back to my white bread comment. I'm sorry if that's offensive to 10 11 anybody but it's -- it seems to unfairly advantage the applicant to have official Board 12 13 14 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: No, we are 15 clearly talking passed each other. 16 MR. JAMES: No, no, I think that's part of the whole evidentiary chain. I mean, 17 18 the whole point of having a hearing is to hear 19 what are the problems. 20 MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: Sure. MR. JAMES: And if you get to see 21 22 something that says there are no problems --

(Simultaneously speaking)

MEMBER ALBERTI: Mr. James, I think you answered his question. You certainly, as I understood it, you answered his question.

And I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Jones? Do you have a question?

MEMBER JONES: Unfortunately yes.

I'm just trying to make sure it's clear.

Forget the investigative report in its entirety, all right. Focus on just what Member Silverstein's question regarding the sequence of events. Do you -- and I'm totally against it, so, but I'm really just trying to make sure we get honest feedback from you without me being biased by my own perceptions.

So given that, given the sequence, would you have a problem with going first in the presentation of evidence to substantiate or support your side of the case as a protestant which is different than the process now where the licensee goes first, then you,

as the protestant group follows on? 1 2 And I think that's really the crux of what Member Silverstein was looking to 3 Forget the investigative report as 4 having weight or not having weight. 5 really just the process issue and I think 6 7 that's really what he was trying to get, what I understood he was trying to get a 8 9 clarification on from you as a, often a member of the protestant side of the table. I think 10 11 that he was just trying to get your 12 perspective. That there, do you understand 13 what I'm saying? Well, I'll just preface 14 MR. JAMES: 15 it but the Board knows I'm not a lawyer. 16 MEMBER JONES: No, exactly. 17 MR. JAMES: And I try to get the 18 rudiments of what's supposed to happen. 19 can't say that I can see an advantage one way 20 or the other. MEMBER JONES: Cool, and that's --21

perfectly acceptable answer, yes.

1	MR. JAMES: I'm going by the code,
2	what the code says is the order and
3	MEMBER JONES: You're comfortable
4	with that?
5	CHAIR MILLER: Where is that? Oh,
6	it doesn't say.
7	MEMBER SILVERSTEIN: It doesn't say
8	what the order is, so.
9	CHAIR MILLER: I don't think the
10	statute says it.
11	MEMBER JONES: You're comfortable
12	with what you've been experiencing?
13	MR. JAMES: Actually the code
14	you may be right. I apologize.
15	CHAIR MILLER: It may be in the
16	regs. We're looking at the regs.
17	MR. JAMES: Yes.
18	(Simultaneously speaking)
19	CHAIR MILLER: Yes, sure.
20	MEMBER ALBERTI: Actually, I have
21	a question for Mr. Grossman, so are we moving
22	on?

1	CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
2	MEMBER ALBERTI: Or Ms. Nichols?
3	I don't know who you want to go first.
4	CHAIR MILLER: Well, I was going to
5	go in the order that they testified. Would
6	that be all right?
7	MEMBER ALBERTI: Okay, great.
8	Great, then I'll hold my question.
9	CHAIR MILLER: Will you hold it?
10	MEMBER ALBERTI: Sure.
11	CHAIR MILLER: Does anybody have a
12	question for Ms. Nichols?
13	MEMBER ALBERTI: No.
14	CHAIR MILLER: Well, all right. I
15	will. MS. NICHOLS: Same
16	question for me that you had for
17	CHAIR MILLER: Exactly. So and I
18	just want to I mean, I have an open mind
19	for this at this point. And it's funny
20	because this is not Mr. Woodson's regulations.
21	I mean, they're not regulations, not subject
22	to these regulations but we kind of opened up

this dialogue.

So that being said, I also want to say I want to set in your kind of initial reaction about as, I sit through those hearings, by the time the protestants come on it's usually late. And it's unfortunate and I see them losing people because some people are old.

And so I see that as one advantage where the focus usually is what the protestants are complaining about or -- so what is your initial feeling? Because I know you haven't thought about this ahead of time or whatever.

MS. NICHOLS: Well, I have a question listening to you because you were at the hearing and heard Mr. Woodson. It sounded as if Mr. Woodson is saying something different today than he did at the hearing.

At the hearing he wanted to change the burden of proof. Today what I heard was the proof is on the record as a whole and that the order could be changed to be beneficial to everyone. And I like that.

The burden of proof does get beyond my legal training but I felt in that case there was so much cloudy stuff. We spent time trying to tease stuff from the owner.

(Simultaneously speaking)

MS. NICHOLS: Okay, in terms of process maybe if I get more experience I would have asked for more time because of certain things that had happened which, I gather, you could grant if you felt that -- because earlier it was can we cut it to 60 minutes. Well, sometimes, and I can learn -- but anyway.

So there were definitely aspects of what he said that I liked. Now this sounds - - and that was why earlier in my testimony I said maybe we need just a hearing on hearings to have more people hear the attorneys, business.

CHAIR MILLER: Maybe we can do that

but we've kind of been using this proceeding
like that a little bit to get your reaction
because you have gone through these hearings
and you know how they've affected you and what
may or may not sound a good idea or not.

But we're also going to leave the record open for you to submit more in writing.

And we'll see but if there's anything else you want to say today about that or anything else

MS. NICHOLS: Well, if I understood what he was saying, that he was making a different suggestion today than what we heard.

I liked the way he said it today. I understood it better. It fit better with my experience and so that the burden of proof would still be on the applicant but the order could be different for establishing that.

CHAIR MILLER: And I think the focus would be more narrower onto the issues that the protestants raise or the investigator raises, yes. Okay.

Okay, thank you very much. Is there 1 2 anybody else here who would like to testify on these regs? 3 MEMBER JONES: Is Board Member 4 Silverstein in the audience that may want to -5 MEMBER ALBERTI: Maybe we should 6 7 ask if he'd like to come up and speak to us. MEMBER JONES: Would you like to 8 9 come up and speak to the Board? 10 CHAIR MILLER: Well I think we have 11 a quorum to close the hearing, I think. Okay, that concludes our hearing this morning on the 12 13 rulemakings for the proposed regulations related to technical and administrative 14 15 rulemaking and -- what's the other one -- the 16 technical rulemaking. Okay, and I understand that the record will remain open for an 17 18 unspecified period of time at this point. 19 Okay, so we are adjourned. 20 (Whereupon, the hearing in the above-entitled matter was concluded at 12:54 21 22 p.m.)

\$1,000 28:7 **a.m** 2:2 abandoned 13:10 34:3 **ABC** 101:7 115:4 118:17 Abigail 97:2 ability 10:4 23:18 50:17 52:19 75:10 83:6,17 102:12 103:15 129:21 able 9:16 20:21 38:12 38:16 47:9 49:7 58:9 66:18 88:17 103:1.17 108:19 124:12 126:7 above-entitled 145:21 **ABRA** 1:20 12:22 120:18 ABRAadjudications... 12:8 absent 19:5 40:20 **Absolutely** 89:7 108:2 acceptable 139:22 accepted 129:7 accident 30:16 accomplish 26:18 accumulated 115:11 achieve 58:1 achieved 58:10 acquisition 118:11 act 3:22 4:3 38:9 101:8 acted 34:10 action 17:2 36:8 109:9 actions 30:18 31:11 34:6 109:9 activities 128:6 activity 52:16 actual 127:8 ad 15:21 Adams 102:14 104:14 109:2 add 45:13 58:14 61:20 71:15 118:22 added 128:5 addition 105:17 additional 4:11,13,20 9:12 16:10 25:19 28:21 99:6 Additionally 3:13 4:1 address 3:14 4:5 12:12 13:1,2 28:21 34:19 35:8 43:18 48:14 49:5 51:18 59:2 67:22 68:5 68:6,7 70:19 74:16 77:18 93:15 121:18 135:2 addressed 117:14 addresses 68:5 adds 3:13 80:8

adiourned 145:19 adjudication 71:17 80:8 adjudications 11:17 administrative 1:6 2:19 3:9 4:2 9:20 31:12 124:2 145:14 adopt 69:13 advance 4:5,10 22:1 56:19 63:9 103:19 131:6 advanced 72:22 advantage 137:12 139:19 142:8 adversarial 5:20 adversaries 5:16 advocate 53:2 **affect** 104:9 affidavit 30:3 **affirmative** 41:1 42:14 affirmatively 92:8 afield 82:7 **agencies** 31:21,22 32:22 120:8 agency 4:4 8:19 11:22 13:16,18 14:4 24:18 32:3,3,7 34:6 37:9,21 111:1 agent 27:1 124:18 agents 135:5 ago 14:21 40:3 48:8 62:19 77:22 79:2 118:9 agree 11:5 61:9 69:14 75:17 76:19 94:9 99:18 103:21 122:10 agreed 57:9 106:3 agreements 102:14 ahead 37:14 59:12 77:6 90:15 95:11 120:21 128:9 142:12 aim 23:14 ajudicatory 49:1 alarm 7:2 Alberti 1:14 2:9 49:10 49:11 52:10 60:9,10 60:18 62:7 85:15,16 87:15,18 88:20 89:8 89:13 90:4,7 91:4,19 97:11,19 98:9 121:12 121:13 132:2,5,8,12 132:17 136:21 137:6 138:2 140:20 141:2,7 141:10,13 145:6 alcohol 5:4 7:20 8:5 22:11,17 29:16 30:17 alcoholic 1:2,10,11 2:5 3:21 8:2 allegation 92:19

allocated 78:13 allow 27:16 56:21 101:7 111:14 112:11 123:17 allowable 20:16 allowed 23:13 61:21 118:2 125:11,14 130:5 allowing 21:21 42:16 52:21 alter 66:21 ambiguous 23:7 **Amen** 76:9 **amendment** 1:7 2:20 3:18,22 8:13 amendments 3:6 amorphous 65:7 amount 58:10,11 76:15 **amounts** 133:11 **analysis** 15:21 16:16 17:7 88:8 113:10 **ANC** 130:8 **ANCs** 12:3 **Andrew** 5:4 7:12 61:10 answer 20:22 28:18 61:4 84:20 85:3 139:22 **answered** 138:3,4 answers 62:3 antique 105:6 **anybody** 48:13 119:15 131:3,8 137:11 141:11 145:2 anymore 114:7 127:11 anyway 25:11 41:8 143:15 **APA** 44:6,11 apartment 109:4 apologize 122:4 140:14 **Appeals** 117:16 appear 11:20 14:22 80:13 111:15 appearance 11:14 appeared 15:5 **appears** 11:13 applaud 8:7 33:6 applicant 20:7 27:8 41:13,18 42:9,13 43:17 45:11 46:16 47:2,6,18 53:4 70:2 71:5 86:6,19,22 89:5 89:11,18 90:1 117:4,9 128:10,13 137:12 144:17 applicant's 93:14 applicants 13:17 14:3,5 24:8 38:13 117:1,4 application 13:10,21 24:6,13 26:17 36:20

103:17 118:4 application's 36:6 applications 34:1,9,21 36:14 38:22 **applies** 93:15 **appreciate** 57:13 66:5 67:10 76:18 99:12 114:15 132:3 138:5 appreciated 98:5 approach 33:11 64:19 approaching 69:10,11 69:12 appropriate 9:22 10:2 11:6 13:6 17:2 18:19 19:12 44:2 94:15 128:14 appropriateness 15:15 15:21 16:5 41:12 85:5 94:1,6,8,12 116:5,8 116:19 117:19 118:21 appropriation 10:11 approval 103:18 area 7:16 105:21 argue 47:19 52:13 argued 124:17 arguing 72:5 argument 20:20 51:22 51:22 88:5 89:17 arguments 85:19,20 arisen 45:3 77:13 arrange 73:16 arrive 55:6 arrows 56:16 art 72:5.8 aside 112:8 asked 13:18 28:6 61:15 87:17 132:15 143:10 asking 7:8 28:7 61:11 134:16 asks 61:14 aspects 143:16 assess 45:9 103:5,6 **assessed** 100:18 assigned 120:18 assist 22:13 associate 22:12 29:14 associated 128:19 association 5:3 7:13 8:4 22:10 29:15 97:4 113:17 115:3 Association's 28:22 associations 12:3 130:10 **assume** 89:5 assuming 136:3 attendance 2:16 attention 12:1 25:1 61:5 76:16 88:9 98:18 121:15 128:17

38:15 41:17 103:14

allocate 78:13

attorney 53:5 118:13 beyond 73:14 74:7 84:7 **bought** 25:12 casual 7:22 attorneys 143:20 84:12 94:2 143:2 **bread** 134:14 137:9 catch 119:2 audience 145:5 **bias** 51:15 briefly 13:9 category 23:11 24:1 authority 103:3,4 **biased** 138:16 **bring** 3:10 25:4 50:19 26:7 available 14:10 21:15 **big** 9:6 34:22 35:3 58:15 112:14 caterers 25:16,17 21:22 28:1 51:4 38:14.14 86:15 bringing 8:7 caught 32:17 aware 2:21 134:13 **brings** 45:7 cause 12:18 33:7 87:14 awful 64:9 114:12 broad 101:22 cease 8:12,15 9:21 10:7 bigger 5:7 128:21 broadened 25:13 10:21 25:21 31:8 32:8 biggest 8:11 awfully 48:16 broadly 87:17 binding 37:17 32:10 **birthday** 112:10 broken 76:5 central 18:11 bit 46:14 54:9 70:14 **brokers** 49:22 **cents** 60:7 **B** 37:2 98:13 126:2 130:5 brought 24:22 25:10 certain 27:17 34:2 144:2 babysitter 68:18 30:9 71:4 37:19 51:7 100:17 **blah** 70:4 back 13:12 14:13 22:5 **brush** 101:22 105:21 143:10 blah-blah 70:5 45:7 75:10.14.16 **Bu** 103:14 certainly 10:2 23:12 77:13 79:5 81:16 **blanket** 34:13 Building 1:11 27:10 39:12 56:3 109:16,21 110:3 **bless** 75:3 buildings 109:4 57:21 58:19 70:21 board 1:2,11 2:6 4:6,8 bunch 127:14 78:20 79:20 99:19 111:14,16 114:16 122:7 135:2 137:9 4:12,18 7:8,11 8:15 burden 14:3 20:10,11 109:15 110:2 121:18 138:3 bad 74:15 102:18 8:18 10:4 14:16,20 39:11 42:8 43:9 44:12 balance 74:3 15:5,22 16:4,9,18 49:13,15 82:4 128:12 certified 12:20 balanced 70:8 17:6,10,13 18:6 19:9 142:20 143:2 144:16 **cetera** 116:5 Bar 114:21 19:19,20 20:15,21 **burdens** 45:15 70:10 chain 137:17 21:6 22:18 27:16 29:1 **Burman** 11:21 **chair** 2:3,12 5:8,12,16 **barely** 113:14 30:2,10,20 31:7 38:19 business 9:1,3,7 10:20 5:21 6:5,10,13,16,20 bargain 56:11 based 56:22 82:1 102:1 39:18 40:1 43:18 45:5 17:8 18:18 26:15 7:1,5 14:9,12,20 22:3 102:19 112:17 115:9 45:9 46:6,21 47:4 62:15 68:16,17 69:5 22:4,8 23:8,19,22 117:8 123:1 125:11 48:10 52:18 57:2 104:6 108:11 143:21 24:3 28:19,20 29:2 bases 50:11 59:15,22 60:19 61:11 business's 17:9 31:1,10,15 33:20 basically 41:4 65:5 61:14,21 63:6 64:6 **businesses** 10:10,15 34:17 35:9,20,22 37:7 16:20 67:2 115:4 67:17 69:14 73:7 76:3 77:3,14,20 37:11,14 39:5,18 41:4 basis 116:9 117:17 78:2,2,22 82:6 85:12 busy 68:15 42:19 44:4,14,19 **Bear** 24:7 91:19 94:20 97:17 46:13 47:11 48:1,3,5 99:16 100:19 101:1 48:11 49:4,10 54:4,8 becoming 105:19 103:2,17,21 105:2 C 37:2 54:14 55:3,10 59:12 beer 23:14 109:8 110:6 114:19 59:18 60:9,17 62:12 began 77:5 call 4:22 40:19 84:11 beginning 45:4 67:12 115:4,7,12,14 116:1,6 97:2,11 102:7 108:20 63:2 64:17 66:9 69:9 116:21 117:14 118:3 71:8,14 72:3,6 73:11 123:22 124:1,1,13 67:20 begins 15:21,22 42:13 118:6,9,17,19 119:1 77:1,15 79:12,14 80:1 126:16 119:12 128:3,15 behalf 7:13 81:9,12,13 85:1,15 called 17:21 124:1 90:8,12,14 95:6,8,9 130:4 131:12,21 behavior 102:18 calling 3:1 4:3 believe 23:1 25:6 49:15 132:10 135:4,11 calls 16:9,12 18:21 95:10 96:12,15 97:1,8 51:1 54:15 61:22 85:3 136:3 137:12 139:15 97:13,16,21 98:3,12 canceled 26:14 73:21 120:14 123:15 145:4.9 98:20 99:3,8 105:12 **capped** 25:10 beneficial 60:19 131:19 **Board's** 16:16 17:1,17 107:12,15,20 108:1 capture 37:22 142:22 21:3,8 25:1 28:15 career 5:20 109:11,14,19 114:14 benign 131:1 33:5 43:22 53:17 carrier 25:17 116:16 119:13,18 best 11:12 56:2 82:9 57:18 58:1 75:18 carries 44:12 121:10,12 122:1,6,18 106:9,12 108:6 123:5,16,20 124:11 bet 32:15 case 28:5 39:10 41:20 124:18 125:7 126:14 better 33:11 35:14 44:6 48:7 52:22 66:22 125:5,10 126:3,6,11 126:21 128:6 126:15 128:1,7 129:2 46:12,18 65:17 79:1,8 66:22 79:3 82:22 boardroom 81:6 129:11,19 131:10 99:13,18 103:1 111:7 83:12 87:7 100:9 132:4,7,15,21 138:6 126:18 130:13 132:19 **bodies** 48:22 59:20 101:19 112:11 131:19 **body** 75:22 78:7 140:5,9,15,19 141:1,4 144:15,15 134:20 138:20 143:3 beverage 1:2,10,11 2:5 **borrow** 44:3 cases 21:20 46:16 141:9,11,14,17 bottle 24:20 25:5 30:7,8 143:22 144:19 145:10 3:21 5:3 8:2 22:11 71:18 75:20 85:21 30:20 chairman 14:16 40:7 124:18 125:15 133:6 29:15 bottles 25:7 43:4 48:4 54:12 64:16 136:3

ı				
	67:4 110:5	clear 12:15 13:5 33:15	12:16	42:5 59:21 74:8
	chairperson 1:12,14	33:16 107:4 138:9	communities 102:10	consideration 53:18
	2:8 7:11	clearly 20:16 79:8 82:14	104:10 130:10	100:20 115:8
	challenge 12:5 15:19	128:12 137:15	community 9:3 12:2	considerations 16:10
	42:16 57:11	client 79:6 83:3	49:9 101:19 102:12	considered 106:1
	challenged 83:2,3	client's 83:5,17	114:22 117:20 134:4	considers 17:13
	challenges 77:18 80:3	clock 6:17 62:9	134:5	consistency 40:9
	chance 69:6 75:8	close 8:22 28:15 31:18	compares 11:7	constitutes 2:17
	113:14	60:3 68:16 102:16	competence 31:22	consumers 23:13,15
	change 26:18 36:1	121:15 145:11	competent 101:6,10,15	consumption 7:20
	39:15 40:4 41:8 56:21	closed 9:15 108:6,7	101:17	22:17
	79:22 82:3 124:2	127:2	complaining 142:10	contact 87:10
	126:10 127:2 142:19	cloudy 143:4	complete 94:6	contain 106:10
	changed 18:15 26:6,10	clubs 25:4	completed 51:6	contained 3:21
	40:17 68:12 111:12	co-chair 14:18	completely 57:13 94:9	contemplates 46:1
	142:22	Coalition 97:3	compliance 9:19 45:10	contested 11:3 41:20
	changes 3:19,20 4:2	code 3:4 15:14 101:7	83:17 85:11 88:11	71:18
	21:17 40:1 46:17	106:13,15 115:21	89:15,19,22 90:17,17	context 85:13 89:6 94:6
	106:11 111:10 115:8	124:9 125:2,3,3	90:18,19,21 91:4,10	contextual 90:3
	115:10 119:12 128:20	128:11,15,16 140:1,2	91:14,16 92:1,8,13	continue 19:18
	changing 82:6 110:19	140:13	93:5,9 94:2,3,7 95:2	contour 73:1
	129:10	coin 93:19	compliance/non-com	contrast 93:11
	Chapter 3:10 24:20	colleague 61:10	92:3	control 1:2,10,11 2:6
	chapters 3:19	color 73:2	compliances 17:11	52:19,19 101:8 103:1
	character 117:5	Columbia 1:1 7:17	compliant 94:12	convene 72:18
	characteristics 84:12	22:10 32:1 79:7	complied 9:12	convenes 4:18
	characterize 114:11	114:20	compress 58:9,11	convenient 56:3
	charges 118:13	Columbia's 2:5 3:7	compressed 58:2	conversation 72:11,20
	charity 134:5	come 11:18 12:10 20:4	concede 94:5	72:21
	cheapening 74:19	20:7 23:17 24:10,19	concern 12:22 23:9	conversations 98:11
	check 133:2	45:17 48:7 53:8,11	30:6 31:11 45:5 85:11	convince 9:17
	checklist 27:22	60:2,3,14,22 66:12	117:8 119:7,9,11	Cool 139:21
	children 68:19	71:7 73:20 75:6,16	123:17 130:7	copies 97:17
	choose 57:6,7 66:2	77:12,13,18 79:5 81:3	concerned 10:6,20 13:9	core 77:9
	chooses 20:7 47:6	90:1 108:11,19	28:2 32:4,21 74:22	corollary 3:20 34:6
	chord 95:2	127:15 135:2 142:5	110:15 117:21 127:20	corporation 26:7 27:1
	circle 104:11 127:3	145:7,9	concerning 8:12 11:3	32:16
	circles 56:16	comes 28:11 65:10	concerns 8:10,12 22:20	corporations 32:12,18
	circumstances 8:14,18 9:9	83:18 120:12 130:2 130:17	64:4 112:13 129:12 concisely 132:20	correct 32:4 61:1 92:10 110:16 123:19
	cite 100:14	comfortable 36:4,10	conclude 30:21	correctly 38:1 123:7
	cited 127:16	140:3,11	concluded 145:21	correctness 19:5,7
	citizen 69:3	coming 12:5 95:4	concludes 92:7 145:12	corresponding 37:20
	citizen's 115:2	114:15 119:20,22	conclusion 89:14	cost 65:15
	citizenry 72:7	121:14	concur 78:21	Council 128:18
	citizens 66:12 67:1	comment 3:5 54:20	condense 98:8,9	counsel 29:14 38:10
	68:17 70:10 97:4	66:11 112:1 137:10	conduct 3:4 16:13 17:7	58:20 59:20 63:10
	113:16	comments 4:9,21 8:9	conducted 112:19	109:20
	city 136:5	11:4 14:6 24:22 30:21	confidence 38:17 39:2	couple 11:4 15:6 48:8
	civic 130:10	75:5 87:2 97:15 99:6	61:22 62:3 65:16	71:10 79:4 115:1
	civil 103:11	113:12,14 132:19	confidently 38:13	course 40:15 59:5 90:1
	claim 93:18	133:21 137:7	confirm 36:19	court 2:22 117:16
	claiming 30:4	commissioners 130:9	conform 3:20	118:12
	clarification 139:9	commitments 24:9	conformance 16:2	cove 25:16
	clarify 49:14	common 8:4 11:16	conforms 17:14	cover 50:10 99:13
	clarity 3:11	12:14 25:16 127:17	confused 49:12	136:4
	classic 72:18 clean 15:22 57:5	communicate 37:9	confusing 12:6 consent 11:15	coverage 25:19 covered 53:10
	cleaning 111:12	communication 12:13 communications 11:17	consider 4:12 19:19	craft 30:3
	5.54iiiig 111.12		331131401 T. 12 13.13	Jiait 00.0
	i			

crank 112:14 crawl 102:4 103:16 104:18 crawls 102:11,15 103:10 104:11 113:1 create 104:6 135:5 created 23:4 102:5 108:17 creating 23:11 82:7 creation 120:16 credence 88:1 critical 55:12 cross 75:3 crucial 16:16 17:17 50:22 crux 139:2 **Curious** 76:10 current 9:7 33:6 135:9 customer 30:18 cut 143:13 **cuts** 37:5 D

D 37:2 **D.C** 1:12 5:3 7:16 14:18 97:2 101:8 113:15 117:16 **damning** 100:10 dancing 117:22 Danetta 4:16 danger 9:18 10:22 dare 32:14 date 13:19,21 14:1 51:8 dates 34:5,6 day 58:3 74:19 80:14 95:17 99:7 108:12 123:3,3,18 days 13:12,13 21:15 24:7,7 56:4,8,19 103:19 114:2 122:14 122:19 123:6,12,12 **DC** 3:3 13:20 29:15 **DCM** 29:19 **DCMR** 23:2,21 24:21 **DCRA** 10:14 deadline 33:9 34:2 56:9 122:7,10,11 **deal** 9:4,6 15:15 31:20 56:11 59:5 77:20 80:7 115:15 134:2,4 dealing 24:16 26:10 32:22 33:22 80:4 115:11 deals 10:8 24:17 decades 115:1 decibel 101:8,16 120:9 **decide** 43:19 decides 37:1

decision 16:1.5 17:1 18:16 21:9 38:16 61:7 62:1 65:16 75:11 80:6 80:7 94:5 126:7 decisions 75:15 76:20 117:15 dedicated 22:16 deemed 34:3 36:6 deems 13:10 defacto 119:3 defend 83:5,16 define 71:1.12 defined 107:10 108:4 127:1 **definitely** 125:1,13 143:16 delisted 27:10 **Denis** 97:4 dense 109:1 Department 8:20,21 9:14,17 32:8 departure 128:15 dependent 24:18 depends 87:6 describes 19:10 71:17 **deserve** 128:17 desire 4:5 8:5 99:12 desired 21:18 40:7 desist 8:13,15 9:21 10:8,21 24:7 25:22 31:8 32:9,11 desk 43:7 76:17 detail 15:3 21:6 determination 19:21 determine 19:20 develop 42:10 47:4 130:16,22 developed 61:6 developing 54:17 development 52:20 dialogue 69:18 81:16 81:22 96:16 114:16 142:1 difference 88:11

81:22 96:16 114:16 142:1 difference 88:11 different 3:11 12:4 19:8 19:15 31:3 42:8 46:15 52:21,21 64:18 68:5 69:10 82:7 100:18 104:9 120:7 125:22 135:15 136:5 138:21 142:17 144:13,18 difficult 9:4 10:11 34:19 35:5 132:18

difficult 9:4 10:11 34:1 35:5 132:18 diligence 120:12 diminished 72:11 diminution 20:9 direct 87:10 137:7 disallow 123:13 disappointing 115:13

discretion 43:22 discuss 8:10 21:5 53:21 58:16 discussed 49:22 discussing 137:2,3 discussion 20:18 24:19 49:17 78:1 82:1 93:6 96:11 97:5,10 98:10 102:2 discussions 51:19 87:13 dismiss 53:18 dismissal 3:15 28:5 dismissed 28:5 disposal 120:9 dispositive 21:20 distance 105:1 distinction 33:21 **District** 1:1 2:5 3:7 7:17 10:10 22:10 31:22 79:7 114:20 118:12 disturbance 94:14 dividing 78:2 **divisive** 105:22 **document** 135:5,6 documentation 13:11 27:16.18 **DOH** 32:8 doing 28:10 33:8 82:11 112:22 door 31:18 119:7 doors 124:5 doubt 18:22 downtown 104:10 dozen 121:1 drastic 31:11 draw 67:8 68:20 **DRCA's** 120:8 dropped 56:8 drug 118:12,15 due 62:18 66:11 67:2,8 68:14 69:7,8 96:2 109:6 120:12 duly 121:10 duplicative 45:12

E E 37:3 earlier 37:5 85:18 105:8 135:11 143:13,18 early 24:10 63:15 70:22 133:10 ears 117:11 easier 56:6 easy 32:2 33:2 119:2

Dupont 104:11 113:16

duties 50:18

duty 53:4

eateries 7:22 8:1 echo 73:14 edges 77:9,10 effect 47:21 58:18 79:19 84:20 102:13 efficient 11:6 41:14 48:20 efforts 63:7 82:9 either 12:19 23:4 33:3 44:21 57:11 90:2 106:22 elderly 112:9 **electronic** 11:15 12:11 elements 82:17 email 11:5 13:2 emails 12:4 emanating 83:19 Emergency 3:22 eminent 55:19 encourage 42:22 encouraging 44:16 ended 109:22 ends 73:21 93:20 **energy** 43:15 enforcement 94:4 engage 7:8 engaged 76:17 engaging 18:18 77:5 enhances 61:22 **enhancing** 78:1 92:12 enlightening 118:18 ensure 4:17 **entirety** 138:11 entities 27:2 **entity** 104:8 entry 11:14 environment 16:19 17:4 19:10 22:16 109:2 err 65:17 **especially** 24:16 25:3 121:16 essence 21:4 essentially 21:1 104:22 129:8 establishing 144:18 establishment 9:1 83:19 99:20 101:2,2 105:3 127:21 136:9 establishments 8:3 99:22 100:1.4 104:14 109:4 118:1 121:2 136:5 et 116:5

even-Steven 132:1

events 59:6 138:13

everybody 64:12 69:7

event 103:14.18

109:1

everybody's 60:13 70:12 evidence 17:22 18:2 20:5 47:9,14 56:22 64:21,22 74:3 83:4 86:17.21.22 88:3 89:4 89:6,10 92:21 93:8 129:4,6 130:16,22 138:19 **evidentiary** 15:8,16,16 16:7 17:18 18:8,10 20:22 21:18 42:10 47:5.7 52:20 53:15 54:1 84:10,15 86:17 89:10 93:14,17 137:17 **exact** 44:5 **exactly** 34:20 139:16 141:17 exaggerated 123:2 examination 130:4 examiner 36:12 example 26:5 32:8 46:4 83:9 88:5 123:1,2 exceed 83:7 excellent 32:19 56:14 74:8 exchanged 128:21 exclusive 109:6 **excuse** 10:16 66:8 **exempt** 29:21 exemption 23:3,4 24:2 29:4 30:4 exhibit 54:16 129:13.14 exhibits 54:19 128:20 130:3 exigency 59:4 exist 16:21 104:4 existence 18:17 19:11 19:18 103:10 existing 115:15 **expand** 25:18 expanding 54:17 expansion 131:14 **expect** 12:12 13:20 70:7 expectation 46:19 expecting 37:18 expensive 25:3 **experience** 26:22 43:6 102:21 115:11 143:9 144:16 experiencing 140:12 expired 9:1 explaining 114:5 explains 15:3 explanation 106:14 exploration 118:17 **explored** 72:15,16

exploring 74:12 expound 96:6 extend 30:18 extent 80:11 extraordinary 59:7 extremely 58:7 75:19 115:13 eyes 108:6

F

fact 20:13 56:8 84:18

84:19 88:4 100:22

face 49:6

facility 25:15

facts 86:14,16 88:2,7 factual 89:17 fail 25:16 failed 115:14 fails 116:7 fair 42:18 65:17 100:11 102:9 fairest 75:9 fairness 44:2 65:8 fake 127:13 fall 57:7 94:15 137:9 familiar 120:2 familiarize 135:12 far 2:8 6:1 55:17 63:5 73:22 82:7 102:6 112:18 131:6 fashion 52:12 fast 47:2 fast-casual 8:1 **faster** 67:9 feature 17:17 features 17:10 fee 28:7 feedback 37:17,21 138:15 feel 5:18 24:14 63:5 84:3 111:1 112:13 136:19 feeling 112:16 142:11 feels 100:8 fees 10:1,1 feet 105:1,2 fellow 125:18 felt 143:3,12 fight 38:14 file 10:15,17 13:21 38:21 39:9 62:21 103:13 108:13 116:15 117:7 123:3,6 filed 4:18 26:17 55:8 122:16 123:11 127:15 filing 105:18 127:8 fill 11:14 final 80:6,7 113:21 114:1

finally 9:16 26:14 28:3 financial 24:9 find 10:11 50:5 56:17 86:8,10 87:3 89:1 91:13.15 95:20 115:14 124:5 finding 94:8 129:22 **findings** 57:17 58:16 finds 88:10 134:17 fine 30:20 33:1 35:12 92:4 107:20 108:1,20 130:5 133:20 135:9 Fine/no 92:4 finished 54:5,5,7 first 11:13 20:3 22:20 26:8 31:4 39:14 41:7 41:17 42:13 43:5 46:20 47:2 57:5 62:14 73:22 94:5 98:16 103:18 110:1,8 112:15 117:2 119:15 134:2 138:18,22 141:3 fit 76:3 117:5,9 144:15 fitness 117:22 119:7 fits 44:5 five 4:7 6:13,18 7:3 67:5 106:7,22 107:9,13 108:3,16 113:4 122:8 122:16 123:10 124:9 124:10 125:19 126:22 127:11 128:4 fixed 32:18 **flavor** 19:15 flip 93:11 flush 89:16 106:15 flushed 89:11 focal 44:15 focus 46:2 53:9 56:7 70:7 71:2 81:17 91:17 132:6 138:11 139:4 142:9 144:20 focused 70:15,15 focusing 50:7 87:19,20 follow 36:18 54:9 85:2 followings 57:6 **follows** 139:1 food 32:9 force 56:1 88:9 119:8 120:3,5,15 121:6 forced 35:17 **foresees** 103:15 forfeiture 118:14 Forget 138:10 139:4 form 11:14 21:16 51:9 55:8 57:16 90:17 124:12

finality 34:8 122:11

formed 108:21 **forms** 20:19 54:16,16 129:13,14 formulated 63:16 forr 82:17 forth 41:10 50:19 100:10 108:4 111:14 111:16 116:14 127:1 **fortunes** 133:14 forum 111:7,14 112:19 forward 8:8 20:5,7 74:4 90:2 93:4 127:15 130:2 found 9:8 35:13 72:21 75:19 78:17 80:2,2 100:3 foundation 84:10 four 14:21 56:12 79:3 frankly 42:3 46:22 61:9 free 84:3 Friday 95:18 front 64:1 65:21 112:11 full-blow 45:11 full-blown 57:18 84:15 function 13:5 18:6 fundamentally 34:12 **funny** 141:19 further 63:9 106:14

G

gather 49:8 143:11 gathered 78:12 general 23:14 41:12 46:20 103:6 116:22 117:3 generally 8:8 26:1 106:1 117:5,9 130:8 130:12 gentleman's 28:17 getting 36:5,15 63:18 81:10 129:14 give 16:18 17:6 26:5 37:21 62:3 73:1 85:12 88:1 104:2 106:13 129:21 given 35:19 52:22 97:19 101:2 115:8 128:19 138:17,17 gives 23:16 51:21 75:9 107:8 giving 29:11 133:10 glad 28:18 110:6,7 121:21 126:19 gleaned 103:9 Glover 114:21 117:20 go 11:7 13:1 26:9 27:4 31:5 37:14 41:9 46:20 47:2 54:4 59:12 62:9 70:13 73:14 89:1

formal 12:18 87:12

90:15 95:11 98:16 116:2.8 118:21 144:13 hypothetical 30:10 102:6 104:21 106:4 127:16 hearing 1:6,11 2:19 3:4 4:3,12,18 40:15 43:3 109:20 112:9 120:21 group 14:19 78:9,10 124:4 130:15,18 83:9,10 106:7 107:6,9 49:12 50:8 51:8 54:22 **i.e** 90:18 134:22 135:1 141:3,5 108:3,6,16,17 124:7,8 56:5.7 58:2 60:11.15 idea 35:2.12 44:12 50:6 60:22 63:19 64:5 **goal** 74:10 124:9.10.13.21 62:16 65:7 70:11 **God** 75:3 125:19 126:22 127:11 65:21 66:22 67:9 71:21 72:12 74:8,15 goes 29:3 33:21 41:17 127:18 128:4 139:1 68:14 69:2 71:10,22 78:10,11 80:1 102:5 groups 108:21 121:18 73:17,21,22 75:1 41:18 44:11 94:1,2 103:1,22 106:3 128:9 78:21 91:7 92:15,16 138:22 126:8,9 144:5 going 3:1 4:22 5:22 quaranteed 115:19 94:21,22 100:15 ideas 35:12 74:6 111:6 guess 23:9 29:20 32:5 6:20 12:11 13:14,15 109:21 110:4.19 111:17.19 14:1 24:11 27:20 33:9 39:14 78:17 88:21 111:18 112:2,18,20 identified 54:19 97:8 129:22 137:8 114:3,4 127:9 128:10 33:17 36:6 38:5,22 immaterial 65:1 41:7 46:8,16 50:7 quidance 64:11 128:18 130:1,19,21 immediate 2:9,12 guilty 118:11 137:18 142:16,18,19 51:15 53:6,11 56:11 imminent 9:18 10:22 gun 56:10 143:19 145:11,12,20 57:3 62:17 63:13 64:1 **impact** 51:18 133:19 68:10,22 69:1,1 70:4 **guys** 59:19 hearings 3:11,12 43:8,8 imply 122:22 74:16,22 75:11 79:6 48:15,18 59:15 60:4 implying 89:9 н 82:12 97:1 98:1,6,8 70:13 71:18 74:19 importance 19:22 98:12 102:6,11 103:3 H-I-R-A-O 29:14 80:15 81:18,19 99:10 50:20 75:18 important 12:16 19:3 104:2 112:18 113:3,4 half 78:2 111:17 112:19 120:17 119:14 128:9 129:1 hand 4:16 12:20 26:2 130:16 142:4 143:19 40:4 55:17 74:11 130:18 131:12 134:9 43:2 46:3 52:22 53:21 144:3 75:22 76:2 85:3,12 134:10,22 138:18 **heart** 119:10 61:12,13 68:11 78:8 86:3,4 112:9 140:1 141:4 144:6 heartburn 43:15 107:9 78:14 84:13 89:20 importantly 85:9 **good** 2:3,11 7:10 10:12 **handle** 15:4.8 Hector 2:10 **impose** 38:5 12:13 14:15 18:3 handled 78:3 help 55:9 57:21 66:4 imposed 38:8 21:12 22:7,8 32:16 handles 40:1 72:17 73:7 82:13 **improve** 65:12 33:20 35:2,12,12 36:2 handling 55:16 114:8 131:12 improvement 41:2 37:11 38:20 48:14 happen 28:13 36:11 **helped** 85:10 114:9 helpful 8:18 22:3 50:6 57:20 60:6 76:13 77:4 122:15 127:6 139:18 improves 52:18 77:9 82:11 83:18 95:6 happened 18:12,20 54:21,21 57:16 70:1 inability 74:1 96:16 99:11 102:4 19:17 96:8 125:14 71:2 86:9,11 99:20 inactivity 34:1 106:3 108:13 111:16 helps 72:19 99:20 131:15 143:11 inappropriate 116:4 117:4 119:1 121:7 happens 16:4 87:12,13 Herman 1:15 2:15 incident 55:19 129:3,6 135:13 144:5 hey 33:8 36:12,18 108:18 include 98:22 106:17 Goose 25:2,7 highlighted 48:9 121:8 **happy** 21:5 Gosh 107:14 hard 47:1 67:3 130:20 Hirao 5:3 22:11 28:20 included 120:8 gotten 13:22 35:13 harmonize 15:12 29:3,8,13,13,18 **includes** 100:16 government 9:5 history 100:16 135:19 **Harris** 26:5 including 7:16,22 33:7 harsh 131:6 government's 69:4 136:8 incomplete 40:8 hold 141:8,9 grant 143:12 hate 32:14 incorporate 22:21 granted 4:7 106:20 hazy 125:19 **Holland** 5:1 14:18 incorporated 27:15 granting 4:12 he'll 109:21 110:2 home 108:12 28:16 honest 49:21 138:15 incremental 40:1 grasping 60:20 head 56:10 132:14 gray 25:6 126:19 health 8:20,21 9:14,17 honestly 101:6 134:14 incurred 65:15 great 14:12 31:1 55:5 26:12 32:7 **honor** 14:19 independent 93:8 61:13 71:13 88:1,17 hear 27:12 38:1 40:22 hope 5:17 88:18 129:4 indicates 116:18 104:9 122:5 133:10 129:7 64:12,22 65:6 66:1 indication 119:5 141:7,8 67:4 68:6,7,22 69:7 host 23:4.6 individual 78:7 94:20 hosts 29:20 greater 21:6 69:19 71:9 74:3 76:10 115:3 hotel 25:15 Grey 25:2,7 80:11,20 95:18 96:9 individuals 4:13 107:10 hours 48:17 60:5 67:6 Grossman 97:3,12 101:13 109:22 110:7 108:3 109:7 126:22 98:17 114:17,18,19 70:14 79:4 133:10 130:11 121:21 137:18 143:20 infirmity 93:15 116:17 140:21 heard 4:11 20:3 46:15 housekeeping 119:1 ground 65:20 99:13 hugely 101:22 62:5 64:8 75:6,7 76:6 informal 73:4 116:20 136:4 hundreds 109:3 95:22 100:12 129:7 information 20:19 grounds 62:22 106:19 hurt 128:3 133:8 142:16,20 21:16 27:5 36:15

40:21 45:9 51:9 54:16 55:8 67:14 68:11 80:18,21 81:1 86:4 99:19 100:13 106:17 128:21 informative 96:20 initial 12:17 15:20 16:17 51:1 106:12 142:3,11 initially 20:8 initium 15:21 **inquire** 104:12 insight 64:11 inspections 26:13 120:13 instance 36:5 69:22 insulting 134:18 intentionally 30:17 interest 49:9 70:13 interested 4:9,20 22:18 81:15 99:4 111:20 interesting 43:11 48:12 80:2 87:9 **interests** 124:15 interim 18:20 19:17 internal 80:3 interpret 86:20 interrupt 8:22 interview 50:4 **interviews** 86:5 87:3 investigative 16:15,18 17:3,5,16,21 18:4 19:1,9 20:3 21:9,14 21:17,22 40:5,6,17 41:2 45:7,8 47:21 50:2,3,21 51:3,6,12 51:13,20 55:7 57:15 57:17 58:17,22 59:3 63:8,18,21 84:9 85:8 88:2,16,22 89:14,20 91:6 92:7,20,22 93:7 93:12 94:1 95:13 96:6 99:17 100:11,16 120:16 135:19 136:8 138:10 139:4 investigator 1:20 45:6 85:5 86:12 88:10,22 91:5,13 93:19 94:10 95:14 96:1 100:21 101:4,5 120:18 121:3 136:13 144:21 investigator's 100:6 investigator/protesta... 41:22 investigators 50:4 55:15 101:9,15 119:22 invite 116:21 invited 127:17

involved 9:2 51:14 77:22 120:15 121:7 125:15 133:14,15 **involves** 55:13,19 irrelevant 64:22 84:8,16 irrespective 17:22 21:11 irritation 78:19 **issuance** 15:20 16:2,12 16:17 **issue** 8:15 10:21 15:10 16:6 25:18 31:13 32:13 33:1 34:5,8 36:13 38:15 39:13 44:15,16 46:3,9 48:9 50:12,13,14 52:11,12 53:22 55:12 68:8 71:3 71:4 77:12 83:10 84:7 84:12,13 89:1 91:16 93:6,9 110:21 134:3,6 139:6 **issued** 16:14 18:13 32:8 issues 23:1 24:17 25:4 26:10,20 27:12 35:7 36:14 39:11 41:10 42:11 43:14 44:10,18 44:22 45:20 46:2 49:6 50:1,5,17 52:3,6 53:3 53:14,16,17,21 54:18 59:2 60:15 62:14,18 62:19 63:11,16 66:1 66:14 70:16 71:1,10 71:11,12 73:2,7 83:8 84:5,8 85:5 86:1,8 90:5 91:14 92:15 94:2 94:11,14 110:17

items 83:7 **James** 2:14 97:4 98:16 98:19,21 99:5,9 101:14 105:13 107:14 107:18,22 108:2 109:13,18 113:1 119:15,16,19 120:3,6 120:14,22 121:13,21 122:5,13,21 123:15 123:19,21 124:16 125:7,13 126:4,10,12 126:17 128:2,11 129:3,16,20 131:11 132:2,11 133:7 134:12,17 135:4,10

136:1,17,19,21 137:5

133:5 144:20

it'd 67:3

it'll 7:2 104:4

item 106:6

137:8.16.21 138:2 139:14,17 140:1,13 140:17 Janea 11:21 Jenkins 11:22 98:21 iob 82:11 **John** 1:20 join 77:2 79:21 108:16 122:8 123:13 124:7 127:17,22 joining 124:20 126:8 Jonathan 11:21 **Jones** 1:15 2:15 6:6,12 6:15,19,22 7:2 29:6 29:10,17 37:13,14,15 38:3,6,11,18 39:3 60:6 73:10.11 81:12 81:13,14 84:1,3,22 90:8,9,11,13,16 91:2 91:3,9,12,22 92:10,14 94:16 122:1,2 138:6,8 139:16,21 140:3,11 145:4.8 judge 101:6 judgment 57:20 judicial 71:20 jury 100:8 justification 28:15 32:6 justifying 82:22 jut 61:16

Kalorama 97:4 keep 89:9 keeping 6:21 kind 18:18 30:8 34:8 47:3 49:3 65:11 66:4 69:21 72:1 73:4 81:15 104:3 110:10 113:9 127:5 132:1,5,9 133:2 141:22 142:3 144:1 kinds 52:2 88:15 Kline 5:4 6:1,4 7:10,12 14:10 22:22 25:22 31:4,6,9,14,19 34:11 34:18 35:10,21 36:9 37:8,12 38:2,4,7,12 38:19 39:6 45:13

Κ

98:6 knee-jerk 10:7 **knifings** 136:9 **Knight** 5:2 14:18

knock 124:4 **know** 7:12 9:5 10:9 11:19,22 12:12 13:8

59:11,13,19 60:12

61:10 62:11,13 63:3

70:21 74:16,21 76:10

93:21 94:19 96:14,19

22:15 24:11 27:9 28:9 32:20 33:13.18 34:15 34:21 35:1,2,4,7,13 35:17,18 36:5 41:16 43:16,17,19 44:5 45:18 46:4 48:16.16 48:20,22 50:11,13,17 53:6,10 54:10 56:15 57:2,3 60:1,21 61:17 63:5 64:1,10 67:13,16 68:9 69:12,15 70:6,7 70:22 72:4,17 75:6 76:14,17 78:8,15 81:7 88:21 90:14 94:14 99:15 100:22 101:10 102:10,13 104:10 105:22 107:15 109:1 109:21 110:2 111:11 120:5 122:6,15 124:3 124:4,17,21 128:22 131:9,14 132:13 133:18 135:10 136:8 136:11,11,17 141:3 142:11 144:4 knowing 60:14 knowledge 121:6 known 67:20 **knows** 29:7 136:3 139:15

L

I53:13 lack 65:15 language 52:7 105:6,17 118:19 125:21 126:1 languish 34:22 large 109:3 Lastly 13:8 late 10:1 77:5 100:5 130:17 142:6 lately 69:11 **law** 45:16 71:17 79:10 79:17 83:6 84:9,17 88:11 122:14 laws 111:12 lawyer 71:22 72:13 139:15 layering 32:6 lead 9:21 learn 143:14 **learned** 118:9 **leave** 7:4 43:21 46:22 57:20 95:5 112:7 144:6 left 2:12 legal 45:15 85:18 143:3 lends 117:16 length 56:15

meters 101:8.16 120:9

lessons 117:6 let's 32:7 46:2 58:11 67:9 68:3 93:2 101:1 127:11 128:3 129:4 **letter** 108:7,13 127:15 letters 83:6 letting 69:12 level 11:10 40:2 80:8 license 9:2,7,14 10:5 15:20 16:2,6,17,21 17:14 18:13,17 19:12 19:17 24:13 25:20 26:6,15 27:9 36:22 45:4,19 51:1 102:5,7 103:16 104:1 116:15 117:18 118:11.14 licensed 7:19 131:16 licensee 16:14 28:1 40:21 45:10 71:6 82:21 84:5,5 103:16 133:19 134:8 138:22 licensee's 33:15 53:5 103:18 licensees 10:9 12:2 32:16 licenses 8:2 25:17 licensing 23:3 24:2,17 26:4 29:4,21 45:22 licensure 117:6,10 118:2 life 36:11 56:6 66:15,21 97:3 108:9 113:15 light 77:6 liked 78:9 143:17 144:14 likes 99:16 limit 59:17 66:17 74:14 75:8 76:1,4 limiting 74:9 106:10 limits 6:8 59:22 118:20 line 67:7,8 68:20 94:19 134:19 lines 86:12 list 25:14 27:3,4,4 listed 11:8 27:13 67:18 104:12,13 120:19 121:1 130:3 136:7 **listen** 110:8 listened 99:2 listening 69:4 81:16 142:15 **listing** 100:1 136:2 little 28:2 34:19 35:5 46:14 58:8 60:7 63:14 70:5,14 98:13 101:11 104:3 144:2 live 68:4 lives 133:14 **LLC** 26:7,20

load 77:21 locate 99:20 location 18:17 long 26:16 41:3 43:4,6 48:16 99:10 102:2 118:9 125:15 longer 41:20 60:5 longest 99:11 longtime 114:20,21 look 16:9 31:21 37:1,8 49:16 56:9 71:16 86:2 86:15 109:15 116:21 looked 36:20 113:5 looking 19:19,20 42:10 43:12 69:21 123:8 133:3,4 139:3 140:16 loose 126:2 **lose** 127:6 losing 132:5 142:7 lost 70:17 **lot** 35:7 39:7 40:7,17 46:1 48:12 49:8 64:9 79:1,20 102:10 107:16 110:1,10

M

128:21 133:13,16

111:18 114:12 115:8

mad 75:14,14,15 Madame 22:3 28:20 81:12 95:9 121:10 mail 11:15 12:11 mail/return 12:20 **mailbox** 11:16 making 32:19 62:1 65:16 85:19 144:12 **MALE** 5:6,10,14,17,19 43:11 man 56:7 manage 78:19 113:19 manner 12:19 55:6 78:4 map 70:5 maps 99:21 March 79:16 Mark 1:19 markedly 115:16 **market** 25:6 Martha 11:21 97:20 **Maryland** 118:12 material 51:17 matter 1:5 32:13 37:22 38:13,14 47:15 70:16 81:20,21 84:9,17,17 84:18 88:3 94:4 108:14 116:3 119:1 145:21 matters 17:22 112:3

mean 31:21 32:7,11,17

32:21 33:1 34:22

36:11.13.13.17 37:5 41:5.6 42:17 44:4 45:14 46:7 60:1 63:12 63:13 69:11 73:6 75:3 75:16 76:12 88:20 94:3.10 101:16 110:10 114:9 122:22 123:2 124:4,8 125:17 126:15 127:5 136:4 137:17 141:18,21 meaning 90:22 92:1 means 35:21 114:6 meant 106:15 measure 44:2 mechanism 60:14 **mediation** 49:19,20 72:15,18,22 87:13 mediator 72:16,19 73:1 126:7,12,14 meet 83:1,6 117:9 118:1 120:10 124:14 MEETING 1:3 meets 116:10 117:11 member 1:14,15,16 2:11 6:6,12,15,19,22 7:2 9:10 14:20 29:6 29:10,17 37:13,15 38:3,6,11,18 39:3 49:11 52:10 60:18 62:7 64:3 65:9 66:8 66:10 67:15,22 68:3 73:9,13 74:18 76:9 80:17,20 81:12,14 84:1,3,22 85:16 87:15 87:18 88:20 89:8 90:4 90:7,11,13,16 91:3,4 91:9,12,19,22 92:10 92:14 94:16,20 95:7,9 95:12 96:13,21 97:11 97:19 98:4,7,9 101:12 114:20 119:17,19 120:4,10,20 121:9,13 122:2 132:2,5,8,12,17 133:7 134:15,21 135:8,18 136:15,18 136:21 137:6,14,20 138:2,8,12 139:3,9,16 139:21 140:3,7,11,20 141:2,7,10,13 145:4,4 145:6,8 members 2:16,17 7:11 7:18 8:4 14:16 31:7 59:22 76:3 78:7 107:11 108:4 110:6 114:18 127:1

methods 11:8 Metropolitan 7:13,16 MICHAEL 1:16 microphone 97:5,10,15 98:11 Mike 2:13 Miller 1:12,14 2:3,7,12 5:8,12,16,21 6:5,10 6:13,16,20 7:1,5 14:9 14:12,16 22:4,8 23:8 23:19.22 24:3 28:19 29:2 31:1,10,15 33:20 34:17 35:9,20,22 37:7 37:11,14 39:5 41:4 42:19 43:4 44:4,14,19 46:13 47:11 48:1.3.4 48:5,11 49:4,10 54:4 54:8,14 55:3,10 59:12 59:18 60:9,17 62:12 63:2 66:9 69:9 71:8 71:14 72:3,6 73:11 77:1,15 79:12,14 81:9 81:13 85:1,15 90:8,12 90:14 95:6,8,10 96:12 96:15 97:1,8,13,16,21 98:3,12,20 99:3,8 105:12 107:12,15,20 108:1 109:11,14,19 110:5 114:14 116:16 119:13,18 121:12 122:1,6,18 123:5,16 123:20 124:11 125:5 125:10 126:3,6,11,15 128:1,7 129:2,11,19 131:10 132:4,7,15,21 138:6 140:5,9,15,19 141:1,4,9,11,14,17 143:22 144:19 145:10 Miller's 64:17 Milton 97:3,12 114:19 mind 24:7 58:4 98:14 141:18 mindful 52:3 mini-industry 104:3 minimized 112:13 minor 30:11,17 56:20 minute 134:22 minutes 4:8 6:14,18 7:3 59:16,16 60:1,2 61:17 74:14 75:3 107:13 113:4 143:13 missed 6:10,12 121:19 122:3 missing 36:16 50:18 86:13 mistakes 9:9 misunderstand 91:18

mentioned 29:5 91:9

merely 26:6

merits 51:14

met 1:11 125:18

mix 98:13

Mm-hmm 34:17 42:19 44:19 47:11 48:1,5 49:4 55:3 58:13 59:18 60:17 72:3 moment 22:5 money 118:10 133:13 135:6 months 9:11 15:7 26:8 26:18 37:4 38:16 48:8 66:13,18 79:3 95:15 118:6 moratorium 106:17 Morgan 102:14 104:14 109:2 morning 2:3,11,16 7:10 14:15 22:7,8 55:16 64:7 73:19 76:7 95:17 95:22 115:5 119:20 133:10 145:12 motion 39:9 move 15:16 21:11 53:18 74:4 121:8 127:7 132:22 **moved** 64:6 **moves** 18:1 moving 106:6 140:21 multi-purpose 25:15 municipal 3:7 mutually 37:17

Ν

N.W 1:12 name 14:17 29:9,12,13 114:19 name's 2:7 **names** 12:4 **Naples** 110:4,5 narrow 52:3,6,16 65:13 88:17 narrowed 43:13 53:3 narrower 144:20 narrowing 42:22 84:4 **narrows** 20:18 nasty 102:21 **nature** 9:20 16:7,20 17:8 18:9 19:2 21:17 28:14 81:18 131:2 necessarily 28:3 36:4 53:11 74:15 necessary 8:16 47:1 65:14 89:19 99:14 116:19 130:22 need 5:6 13:16 25:18 27:20,22 32:10 35:19 36:22 37:2,9 50:19 62:18,19 63:11,14 74:3,4 80:13 96:9 103:4 121:18 143:19

needed 16:8 56:18 61:15 115:9 needs 12:1 25:13 34:13 96:5 117:13 122:9,11 134:19 negatively 128:5 neighbor 83:18 105:22 106:1 124:5 neighborhood 99:21 135:14 neighborhoods 130:12 neighbors 104:22 127:20 never 13:22 69:18 79:19 112:4 131:16 134:15,17 135:16,16 new 3:13 23:11 38:15 54:10,14 103:15 120:2.5 newbie 113:21 **Nichols** 97:2,6,16,17,18 98:1,16 133:8 141:2 141:12,15 142:14 143:8 144:11 Nick 1:14 2:8 **night** 89:1 95:18 97:3 100:6 113:15 nightclubs 25:15 nightmare 79:5 nights 89:2 95:14 nine 75:1,2 noise 46:4 83:10,16,18 88:6,8,9,13 89:1 94:13 97:3 100:22 101:3,8 110:21 111:1 112:20 119:3 120:1,2 120:13 non 89:21 93:4 non-compliance 89:21 89:22 92:17 93:13,18 normal 41:20 59:5 normally 41:16 notable 118:7 note 17:20 19:4 noted 55:4 121:10 notice 12:10 13:7 27:11 31:16 36:3,5,9 62:14 62:18,19 113:8,8 133:5 **noticed** 101:3 111:13 notices 10:14 12:18 13:20 32:20 63:11 notified 4:4 noting 121:16 notion 78:12 117:17 notoriously 32:19 **November** 1:9 2:6

21:20 64:4 84:5 88:8 100:3 106:22 108:18 numerous 27:2

0

o'clock 55:15 64:7 95:15,15,16,17,22 **OAG** 1:19 objected 116:3 objecting 126:20 objection 19:22 20:1 116:19 117:18,19 124:20 objections 118:3 **objective** 47:4 57:22 71:19 objectors 104:21 obligation 47:8 observation 102:1 obtain 4:8 obtaining 8:2 **obviate** 47:8 80:12 obvious 59:14 115:7 obviously 9:22 45:22 100:14 occasionally 129:6 occasions 15:6 61:8,9 occupancy 26:9 offense 134:14 offensive 137:10 offer 18:3 20:15 34:20 office 10:8 12:1 27:1 36:17 official 3:3 137:12 oftentimes 44:1 **oh** 5:8 12:10 29:8 37:2 54:4,8,9 79:14 81:7 95:10 97:21 98:9 100:15 102:20 104:5 111:6 112:14 114:7 127:10,21 130:4 131:16 136:8 140:5 okay 2:3 4:22 5:21 6:5 6:12 7:1,9 14:9,13 22:5 24:3 28:19 29:2 29:3 31:2,10,15 33:20 34:17 35:9 37:7,11 38:3,16 39:5,7 41:4 46:13 48:1,21 49:10 54:8 55:3 60:9 62:12 67:15,22 68:21 71:14 84:1 90:7,8,14 91:22 94:16 95:6,7 96:12 97:1,21 98:3,12,15,18 98:20 99:8 105:12 107:20 109:11 110:4 112:17 119:13 120:20 122:5,6 123:20 124:11 126:3 128:1,7

129:11.19 131:10 132:7,21 134:15 141:7 143:8 144:22 145:1,11,16,19 **old** 103:13 104:20 142:7 older 35:13 Omnibus 3:21 on-premises 7:20 **onboard** 129:15 once 60:3 81:3 one's 76:16 117:11 ones 99:11 103:7 105:9 open 4:19 20:17 36:22 46:22 48:21 141:18 144:7 145:17 opened 25:12 141:22 operate 79:10,12,17 operation 40:22 45:10 operational 17:7,10 45:3 84:11 operator 23:5,7 opinion 88:4,12 opportunity 20:4 59:2 87:10 **options** 46:22 oral 40:14 order 33:14 41:11 63:4 82:4,5 98:13 116:20 119:3,10 129:10 140:2,8 141:5 142:22 144:17 ordering 46:19 orders 8:13,16 10:21 25:22 31:8 33:7 organized 124:21 organizer 103:13 original 18:22 originally 82:1,15 83:20 ought 46:22 124:12 outside 96:8 overall 65:19 overcome 112:16 overlooking 26:3

owner 143:5

owners 106:8

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2:1 **P.C** 5:2 p.m 145:22 Page 106:12 pages 56:15 paid 33:3 65:14 135:5 paint 101:22 panel 4:22 80:5,10,12 97:2 110:1

nude 117:22

number 3:19 10:8,9

panels 3:1 79:10,13,18 80:1 82:7 **paper** 72:5 **papers** 11:3 paragraph 106:12 parallel 34:5 47:20 Pardon 80:19 107:11 Park 117:20 parking 46:5,9,10 50:11 52:12 119:3 134:2 **parking's** 134:3 **Parks** 114:22 part 18:7 21:10 54:10 54:14 106:19 107:7 112:3,16 125:18 130:3 131:21 136:7 137:17 **participant** 5:6,10,14 5:17,19 43:11 115:18 participate 77:19 participated 110:9 participating 104:16 participation 80:12 109:10 particular 20:13 32:3 100:7 129:9 particularly 15:1 21:13 22:2 31:19 43:9 45:1 45:1 55:1 62:5 63:14 103:21 117:21 130:15 parties 4:9,20 18:5,10 20:4 21:19 22:1 49:18 49:21 50:5 51:11,18 56:3,9 57:21 61:15 63:13 72:18,19 77:19 77:19 124:12 128:22 133:5 partner 14:17 113:15 parts 25:19 86:3,4 104:10 106:13 party 3:14,14 11:13 18:1 21:11 28:4 30:2 30:3 41:15 51:14 106:7 108:16 122:8 123:10 Pascal 5:2,2 22:6,7,9 23:9,21 24:1,4 53:1 70:20 71:9 78:20 79:13,15 81:5 passed 136:16 137:15 path 57:6,7,7 **Paul** 5:2 **pause** 23:16 pay 10:1 12:1 33:9,16 76:16 98:17 payer 135:6 paying 121:15 133:12 **payment** 33:1,2 **pays** 61:5

peace 41:11 63:4 119:3 penalties 9:22 103:4,6 penalty 103:11 pending 118:5,8 **people** 12:9 32:20 38:17 48:13 59:17 67:18 68:4.22 69:12 69:19 70:16 73:15 75:6,13 78:9 86:7 105:16 107:5 108:19 108:22 109:3 122:16 123:11 124:14 126:8 127:19 130:10 133:9 142:7,7 143:20 percent 32:15 40:13 perception 49:13 50:10 50:16.18 perceptions 138:16 perennial 77:16 perfect 78:16 perfectly 139:22 period 18:21 37:19 45:4 108:10,12 116:2 122:14,20 136:10 145:18 periodic 17:11 peripheral 70:17 permissions 11:2 permit 26:9 29:1 permitted 29:19 43:21 persnickety 64:17 person 30:14,15 68:15 68:16 69:3,5 80:16 112:9 118:10 126:13 126:16 127:22 128:4 person's 69:13 personally 48:15 persons 23:12 106:18 **perspective** 16:19 90:3 139:12 persuasion 44:13 persuasive 47:9 petition 105:20 108:5 112:15 petitions 104:19 105:6 105:14,15 **phase** 36:14 photographs 99:21 131:1,11,13 phrase 44:3 114:6 **picked** 113:1 picking 113:2 **picture** 86:16 pictures 56:16 **piece** 16:16 89:4,10 93:8

PIF 56:21 58:14 59:1

68:10,13 69:22

128:20 130:3

PIFs 63:7 pioneer 62:14 pit 57:8 placards 13:20 39:1 place 11:11 19:12 130:1 135:20 plan 114:1 play 65:11 plead 118:11 pleading 12:18 please 2:21 4:16 91:1 pleased 22:18 pleasure 14:19 point 20:2 32:11 36:2 39:2 42:4 44:16 45:14 47:12 48:12 56:1 57:11 66:5 67:11 69:15 71:16 81:2 85:3 88:21 89:8 96:2 105:16 107:19 109:16 113:6 114:2 124:22 127:12 133:20 137:18 141:19 145:18 **pointing** 121:20 points 14:8 28:22 83:1 94:17 policy 32:6 35:21 ponder 30:10 portends 93:16 position 116:7,12 126:9 possibility 94:7 possible 27:7 58:14 83:2 potential 29:22 103:16 practical 42:6 45:17 46:8 practically 46:6 practice 14:18 33:6,8 124:17 practiced 72:5,8 practitioner 78:22 practitioners 85:19 **pre** 71:2,21 108:20 pre-formed 124:10,20 125:4 **pre-hearing** 70:3 71:1 pre-trial 71:22 72:12 precautions 11:11 predecessors 63:11 preface 139:14 prehearing 52:16 prejudice 101:19 prejudicing 100:8 preliminary 57:15,17 **premise** 131:14 **premises** 23:5,5 prepare 63:22 prepared 4:15 40:10 71:6

preparing 54:21 prescribed 105:1 present 1:13,18 7:7 15:16 83:4,12 84:6 86:21,22 105:2 118:3 presentation 84:16 88:4 138:19 presented 73:3 82:2 presenting 86:13 129:1 presents 47:15 president 29:15 presiding 1:12 **presumption** 19:5,7,13 19:14,15,16 pretrial 51:19 52:15 53:2 **pretty** 31:3 76:7,12 99:11 104:19 105:10 129:14 prevent 125:8 previously 19:11 price 65:14 primarily 49:6 70:15 primary 30:5 prior 56:4 103:14 probably 8:11 35:14 70:8 75:9 85:21 104:2 129:17 problem 15:12 34:15 35:1,3,8,11 42:21 43:1 44:1 65:3 74:4 77:17 93:16 95:20 100:3,5,22 101:3 103:12 117:13 119:10 134:7,13,18 138:18 problems 45:3 58:7 111:1,13 134:1 135:1 135:3 137:19,22 procedural 1:6 2:20 3:9 82:17 112:2 115:9,16 procedurally 41:5 46:11,14 procedure 7:6 39:16 46:18 53:2 82:4,5 87:7 procedure's 87:8 procedures 3:12 52:21 **proceeding** 3:2 17:19 18:2 20:2,8,17 21:2 43:1 44:21 45:1,11 47:3,17 52:22 53:21 58:20 67:12,20 71:16 81:3 84:14 88:15 93:6 110:9 118:8,17 119:4 144:1 proceedings 2:21 3:16 11:4 20:16 21:10 43:13 51:2 65:12 77:3

77:20 78:3 87:14

115:5.12 process 13:6,13 15:5 26:15 31:17 49:16 62:1,18 66:12 67:1,3 67:8 68:14 69:7,8 74:20 76:5 82:10.12 82:13 96:2 99:13 104:21 109:7 110:20 113:22 137:1 138:21 139:6 143:9 product 23:18 25:3,6 118:15 products 23:17 25:2 32:10 professional 131:22 133:4 professionals 130:14 proficiency 121:17 progress 78:18 prohibited 125:3 **promise** 13:22 proof 20:10,11 39:11 42:8 82:5 128:12 142:20,21 143:2 144:16 **proper** 127:16 properly 4:17 property 50:12 106:8 proponent 20:13 44:11 proponents 44:7,9 proposal 23:2 83:21 122:9 125:6,8 126:21 proposals 24:5 propose 44:9 proposed 3:5,17 29:18 82:15,16,18 107:8 110:18 145:13 **proposing** 111:8,9 124:15 proposition 15:18 protect 29:22 30:5 protected 102:17 protest 1:5 3:15 17:18 19:2,6 20:6,15,19 21:15 22:1 24:6 39:10 43:14 49:8 51:7,8,9 52:4,7 53:7 54:15 55:8 56:4,7,8 62:22 67:14 78:5 81:18 84:8 84:12 86:4,5 87:8,19 88:6 91:7 92:15,16 94:21 104:19,20 105:5,15,18 106:19 108:5,7,9,12 116:2,3 116:7,9,10,15,20 117:8,11 120:17 122:14,17 123:4,6 127:2,8,8,15 128:10 130:15 133:20 134:9

134:13 135:7 137:2 protestable 102:8 103:22 protestant 20:17 41:17 42:13 43:21 47:16 51:22 83:8.9 93:10 105:19 117:7 119:9 127:7 130:2 131:19 138:21 139:1,10 protestant's 51:21 52:5 protestants 20:1 22:1 41:9 43:16 44:7 45:19 46:3.20 62:6 69:20 70:3 76:11 85:20 86:6 87:11 92:19 93:1,4 95:16,21 96:7 115:4 122:8 125:18 128:9 129:5 133:22 142:5 142:10 144:21 protested 124:6 protesters 42:16 protests 24:12 40:18 44:18.20 52:4 87:16 105:16 106:2 110:11 115:22 118:20 prove 88:15 92:12 provide 47:7,9 53:15 64:10 84:10 90:2 provided 31:16 57:18 85:9,10 93:17 providers 7:15 **provides** 8:14 47:16 providing 134:5 **provision** 8:12 13:9 16:8 23:20 24:21 25:9 33:18 36:3 62:20 79:9 79:17 115:15,20 **provisions** 15:13,14 27:11 102:15 **pub** 102:4,11,15 103:10 103:16 104:11,17 **public** 2:18 3:4 9:18 11:1 55:20 131:8 publication 113:7 **publish** 114:1,4 **pull** 13:1 **punish** 28:9 punitive 28:14 purpose 51:11 53:20 88:17 purposes 92:20 pursuant 3:3 36:7 put 16:11 39:8 51:12 74:10 75:2,11 79:4,19 82:22 83:15 86:16 89:6 93:4 100:9 103:11 114:12 118:10

putting 14:2 33:11 34:8 70:9 91:6 112:10 126:8

qualifications 116:22 120:11 qualify 105:16 qualitatively 19:8 quality 66:15 quarter 75:10,14 quarterly 27:14 Querying 18:19 question 16:13 18:12 18:21 30:12 33:21 46:11 55:13.22 59:21 69:17 84:11 90:13,15 93:3 132:16 138:3,4,7 138:12 140:21 141:8 141:12,16 142:14 questioning 75:18 109:17 questions 7:8 14:11,14 20:22 22:14 28:18 31:4,5,6 37:12 39:5,7 41:5 61:11,14,21 62:2 76:2 119:14,16 136:14 quick 37:13 **quickly** 121:14

134:14 quorum 2:17 145:11

quite 101:5 131:1

quiet 41:11 63:4 119:4

Raines 11:21 raise 53:7 77:11 85

raise 53:7 77:11 85:6 94:10 119:9,11 144:21 raised 34:4 57:12 83:8 raises 144:22 **raising** 39:10 **RAMW** 7:14,14 ran 112:3 129:16 **RANC** 115:2 range 7:21 rational 28:12 rationale 28:4,8 raw 99:19 reaction 142:3 144:2 read 86:11 110:2,15 120:6 readiness 119:21 reading 116:13 ready 6:1,2,3 7:9 36:21

real 26:3 36:11 37:13

40:21 119:10 121:14

reality 108:9 130:17 realize 87:18 realized 131:16 really 15:1 18:4 24:15 25:7 32:11,13 34:22 35:10 42:9,15,20 43:1 44:11 49:2,12 51:4 52:11,12 55:9 60:6,20 69:6 70:14 71:2,11,19 77:4 78:9,11 82:5 85:13 86:8 87:22 88:2 102:18 113:16 114:14 119:11 128:3 132:3 132:13 136:21 138:14 139:2,6,7 reargue 48:7 reason 10:12 16:11 20:19 28:12 119:8

20:19 28:12 119:8
reasonable 74:2 76:20
106:16
reasons 51:5,10 105:14
rebut 58:16 90:2 93:11
93:17 129:8 134:11
135:2
rebuttal 41:16,18 42:5
42:14 46:17 47:7

42:14 46:17 47:7 133:22 rebuttals 43:20 recall 111:18 receipt 12:20 receive 58:21 90:19 received 116:1 receiving 12:15 55:7

recitation 63:4

reconcile 56:18

recite 63:13

recognize 31:16 recognized 116:10 recommend 12:17 recommendation 21:8 39:15

reconsideration 118:4

record 4:19 18:8 20:12 20:22 21:10 29:6 32:15 33:8,14 35:6 36:2 39:9 42:11 47:5 47:7,10,14 52:19 54:2 57:19 61:6 65:13 76:6

142:21 144:7 145:17 recorded 2:22 Reeves 1:11 reference 37:16 references 54:11,15 104:18 referring 23:20 91:5

92:12 96:5 100:17

115:20 refers 104:20 refine 77:9,10

126:19

reflected 135:16.16 **refutes** 135:7 reg 51:1 107:8 113:9 regarding 4:5 16:1 37:21 138:12 register 4:10 13:20 registered 27:1 120:1 regs 33:19 124:3 128:16 140:16,16 145:3 regular 59:7 regulating 82:10 regulation 3:22 33:12 33:22 36:7 110:22 112:21 122:20 regulations 3:8 8:7 11:9 22:19 39:16 90:18 94:13 103:9 106:14 110:15,18 111:3 121:16 123:8 123:13 141:20,21,22 145:13 regulatory 9:19 17:11 48:22 89:15,18 92:8 94:4,21 110:9 113:22 114:9 reinstated 28:6 rejected 127:20 rejection 118:5 rejoinder 89:13 relate 3:15 8:18 45:21 related 3:12 4:2 91:7 145:14 relation 105:11 relationship 15:13 relative 58:4 87:1 92:16 relayed 125:2 relief 59:7,8 reluctant 61:16,18 remain 4:19 145:17 remains 42:9 44:13 remark 67:11 77:3 79:22 remarks 4:16 15:3 21:4 22:21 28:17 99:1 remember 64:6 remiss 53:4 removal 52:11 renew 32:20 renewal 9:10 15:4,9 16:8,12 17:4,14 18:2 18:11,12,14 20:6 21:2 27:3 28:7,8 32:17 43:13 49:7,14 84:6 renewals 16:10 18:11 21:13 22:2 27:6 39:12 39:19,19 40:2,19 50:22 renewed 45:20

reoccur 66:7 reorganizes 3:10 repealed 105:7,8,10 repeat 23:20 repeatedly 13:19 repetitious 65:1.2 66:6 repetitive 112:12 report 10:18 16:15,18 17:3,5,16 18:1,4,5 19:2,9 20:3 21:17,22 41:7 45:8,8 47:21 50:2,3,21 51:6,13,20 55:7 56:22 57:16,18 58:17,22 59:3 63:8 84:10 85:8 86:10 87:1 88:2,16,22 89:9,20 91:6 92:7,9,20,22 93:7,12 94:1 95:13,19 96:7 100:11 133:21 134:9,13 138:10 139:4 report's 89:14 reporter 2:22 reports 10:16 17:21 21:9,14 40:5,6,10,10 40:12,14,17 41:2 51:3 51:17 56:4,14 63:18 63:21 86:5 87:4 99:17 100:17 120:16 136:2 137:3 represent 22:10 representative 86:19 represented 115:2 representing 82:21 represents 7:14 request 18:14 21:14 105:4 requested 12:21 required 10:15,17 21.16 requirement 9:12,13 24:2 29:4,21 37:20 117:3,12 requirements 9:19 10:18 23:3 54:18 116:11 117:2,10 118:1 **requires** 106:18 requiring 21:1 63:12 requisite 106:22 rerun 21:1 reservations 13:4 reserve 58:15 133:21 resident 112:7 113:6 114:10,21 resident's 112:11 residents 106:8 112:1

respond 41:14 62:11 87:22 111:22 responded 88:19 responds 42:14 response 53:14 91:3,18 responsibilities 117:6 responsibly 8:6 rest 86:10 110:3 restaurant 7:13,15 30:13 restaurants 7:15,17,22 25:14 restraints 26:17 restriction 126:2 result 62:20 63:9 92:17 retailer 30:19 retrospective 16:13 returned 9:11 returns 108:10 reveal 51:20 88:7 reveals 45:8 86:7 review 16:13 17:6,17 124:2 revisit 15:11 revisiting 48:10 revoke 10:4 **rid** 118:19 right 2:8,9 6:1,17 11:19 27:11 31:18 38:11,18 39:6 44:14 58:5,15 63:19 65:9,21 71:8 72:6 74:21 77:7,15 81:9 86:14,18 87:18 89:3 95:8 114:17 123:8,11 125:5,11 128:1,8 129:2 132:7 132:15 137:5 138:11 140:14 141:6,14 rights 115:18 Risa 5:3 22:11 29:13 rise 11:9 road 70:5 **Rob** 57:3 **Robert** 14:17 **Rod** 5:1 Rodriguez 2:10,11 64:3 65:9 109:20 role 72:17 126:14 roles 75:22 **roll** 108:20 123:22 124:1,13 126:16 room 1:11 7:4 45:18 rooms 62:16 rounds 59:21

resolved 32:2

resources 21:3

respect 31:8 32:9,12

34:9 39:11 41:11,15

54:20 76:15 94:11

routine 120:15 rudiments 139:18 rule 8:6 23:14 30:21 34:13 47:2 rulemaking 1:7 2:21 3:2 3:10,13,17,18 4:1 8:8 145:15,16 rulemakings 1:6 2:19 2:20 3:5 145:13 rules 6:7 17:20 29:18 35:14,15,16 54:10,15 64:21 65:20 113:21 114:1,4 115:9,16 133:1 **running** 10:19 rush 112:6 113:21 **Ruthanne** 1:12,14 2:7 Ruzzio 1:19

S safe 22:16 safeguards 11:11 safety 55:20 83:15 sale 7:19 22:16 32:9 sanction 104:2 sat 49:21 99:9 112:4 **Saturday** 95:18 save 43:14 savings 82:17,20 129:9 saw 15:12 saying 36:21 38:4 46:2 50:9 60:12,13 69:14 79:6 83:20 92:2 95:16 101:21 121:4 122:18 123:5 124:12 125:12 127:13,14 134:22 139:13 142:17 144:12 says 24:1 38:21 46:16 62:21 69:4,7 75:17 83:10 89:21 92:22 93:13 95:13,19 103:13 124:9 137:22 140:2,10 scale 58:4 scenario 83:2 96:7,9 schedule 68:16 74:2 schedules 73:16 scheme 45:22 **scope** 43:1 screamed 62:17 screaming 63:10 seated 30:14,16 93:21 second 3:17 41:18 74:1 81:5 123:9 section 8:14 11:17 102:4 103:11 105:7 107:3 115:21 116:14 116:18,22 117:12

112:13 113:8 115:3

resolve 33:3

118:20

II
sections 3:14 31:20
105:8
security 83:14
see 22:18 41:10,19 42:7
42:15 58:9 63:20
64:10 73:7 76:5 82:20 86:22 87:4 97:8
100.15 103.2 111.3
128:2,5 129:9 131:8 135:15 137:21 139:19
135:15 137:21 139:19
142:6,8 144:8
seeing 100:5 seek 62:3
seeking 118:14
seen 57:1 58:18 110:10
120:22
sell 8:5 23:10,11,13,14
29:20
Sellers 22:11 selling 30:1
send 10:14 27:3,5
sending 108:7
sense 12:14 26:1 42:7
44:9 71:20 73:3 92:1
92:3,4 119:1,8 sent 9:10,13
separate 112:20
separately 111:4 113:3
sequence 138:13,17
sere 83:20
serious 71:11
serve 8:5 12:11 13:2 30:17 52:2
served 12:19
serves 52:16 88:16
service 7:15,19 8:22
11:3,5,8,15 24:20
30:7,21 serving 14:20 30:12
set 12:7 24:15 41:10
108:4 112:8 127:1
142:3
sets 116:14
settlement 102:14
setup 41:20 seven 8:14 9:11 38:16
66:13 108:17 114:10
severely 115:18
share 6:8
Shaw 113:16
she'll 4:17 sheet 67:14,18
short 2:14,15 61:4 66:8
66:9,10 67:11,15,22
68:3 73:14 76:9 80:17
80:20 95:7,9,10,12
96:5,13 119:17,18,19
120:4,10,20 121:9 Short's 111:22

shortens 122:20
shot 42:17
shotgun 53:7,14,16
show 12:18 31:17 33:7
70:4 87:14 99:22
106:11 113:11,14
128:13 131:13
showed 124:19
showing 129:22
shows 6:18
side 53:8 62:16 65:18 69:20 72:2 74:15
75:10 76:18 93:12,19
111:11,11 127:10
129:5,5,8 133:13
138:20 139:10
side's 133:12
sides 70:8 133:16
sign 30:4
signatures 112:15
significance 117:2
significant 24:9
Silverstein 1:16 2:13,14 55:10,11 57:9 58:13
59:9 73:9,12,13 74:18
96:21 98:4,7 101:12
133:7 134:15,21
135:8,18 136:15,18
137:14,20 139:3
140:7 145:5
Silverstein's 136:22
138:12
similar 19:14 49:1
124:14 simple 61:4
simple 61.4 simply 68:21 84:17,18
134:8
Simultaneously 62:10
138:1 140:18 143:7
sir 68:2 101:13 121:11
sit 34:14,14,14,15 35:4
67:5 72:1 134:9 142:4
site 13:1
sitting 81:15
situation 10:7,21
six 2:15 37:4 48:17
66:13,18 67:5 70:13 103:14
size 77:14 78:1 82:6
skilled 85:19,22
slate 15:22
sleeping 76:16
slide 119:6
slight 82:3
slightest 117:16
slip 27:8
Smith 1:20
softening 131:20
solely 115:6 117:8

solution 34:20 77:13
78:16
somebody 35:1,11 37:1 108:10 123:12 124:19
127:7 someone's 88:12
somewhat 54:18 62:13
sophisticated 52:5
sorry 6:6 23:19 54:12
85:17 95:11 101:14
106:5 116:16 120:20
132:16 137:10
sort 23:7 49:11 51:13
55:21 57:15 60:10
76:1 90:20 94:22
104:2 105:3 109:9
131:22
sound 7:3 144:5
sounded 142:16
sounds 41:14 102:21
143:17
source 59:8
space 16:22
speak 4:8 66:3,3 83:14
83:14,15 90:16 112:1
134:10 145:7,9
speaking 62:10 90:21
115:6 130:8 138:1
140:18 143:7
specific 45:20 83:7
133:1
specifically 16:9 60:16
134:1
spell 126:18
spend 76:14 78:8
spend 70.14 70.0 spending 54:2 110:1
spent 107:15 143:4
spoke 43:4
spread 5:8,12
staff 12:22 18:6 30:13
40:2 55:14 56:13
57:12 116:6
stages 63:15
stake 133:17
stand 82:12 121:5
standard 47:13
standardization 40:16
standards 52:8 107:5
116:5,14
standing 3:14 10:12
32:17 106:7,21
standpoint 45:17 46:8
95:3
stands 89:9 93:7
start 5:22 6:2 13:6 31:2
31:4 49:16,20 97:9
119:14
started 42:4 82:2 113:2
starting 20:2

state 29:8,12 59:11
62:22 106:21 116:2,8
stated 92:9 117:3
statement 51:15 70:3
72:12 111:10 112:21
113:22 119:21 131:9
statements 27:14 71:1
states 115:21 128:12
Status 1:6
statute 16:3 17:15
62:21 115:10,17,19
116:11,13 117:15
122:19 125:11 140:10
statutory 38:20 63:2,3
staying 81:20
step 70:1 104:1
sticking 38:20
stop 74:11
stopwatch 60:7
story 86:18
straddle 134:19
stragglers 108:22
straight 61:3,4 67:12
straightforward 107:4
streamline 49:7 69:16
79:20 99:12
street 1:12 68:4
stretch 60:4
strict 13:15
strikes 21:2
strongly 23:1
struck 85:18 95:2
structure 20:21
structured 110:13
struggle 94:17
stubborn 114:11
study 113:9
stuff 56:17 72:1 129:13
143:4,5
style 64:19 66:21
subject 20:18 81:20,21
93:5 96:10 112:19
128:17 141:21
submission 16:7 21:18
51:9 54:1 59:1 71:22
93:14,17
submissions 15:9,17
17:18 18:10 52:20
submit 4:20 14:7 56:21
103:17 113:3 144:7
submitted 15:2 113:17
132:19
submitting 111:4
substantial 47:13
substantiate 138:19
substantiates 47:17
sudden 131:15
suffer 74:5
suffered 79:2

sufficient 27:15,17,18 110:17.18 113:13 120:17 three-year 136:10 thrilled 40:14 132:13 133:11,18 **things** 10:19 24:10 27:21 throw 30:9 62:17 66:11 suggest 12:7 106:11 136:15 137:15 26:19 30:19 34:10 70:11 119:2 112:18 131:20 132:9 35:16 50:3 51:5 52:2 target 60:21 thrown 117:10 suggested 51:5 task 88:9 120:2,5,15 52:16 56:2 62:2 66:20 suggestion 106:9 107:2 68:12 74:2.4 76:7 tighten 126:4 121:6 taverns 25:14 126:20 144:13 79:20 86:13 105:22 tighter 76:13 110:14 113:2 127:6 time 4:11,13 6:8 10:1 suggestions 110:19 tax 135:6 131:18 133:17 135:15 **sum** 15:4 60:11 tease 143:5 11:13 13:8 14:7 18:13 technical 1:6 2:20 3:18 135:22 143:11 18:14 21:4 26:16 27:2 supplied 13:11 **support** 8:9 15:17 26:1 32:13 145:14,16 think 6:10 7:5 8:17 11:6 28:21 33:16 36:21 51:21 53:15 113:12 technically 26:20 11:10,12 12:13 13:13 37:17,19 40:2,6,13,20 113:16 117:17 138:20 Teeter 26:6 14:1 15:2 21:21 23:6 43:5,5,6,10,15 48:16 **suppose** 48:21 tell 20:20 38:13,17 39:1 25:13,18 27:19 29:7 51:7 54:2 55:2,8,14 supposed 10:3 67:17 82:19 86:18 95:21 29:21 31:10 33:1,5,10 56:1 57:12 58:2,3,6,9 139:18 104:13 120:4 35:11 36:10 37:5 58:11,22 59:17,22 **suppress** 109:10 ten 21:15 32:15 65:4.6 43:14.22 45:14 46:1.6 61:10 63:20 65:11,14 **sure** 6:7 8:16 12:14 65:22 67:18 68:4 46:7,10,18,21 47:1 66:7,17 67:21 68:13 29:7 32:19 34:11,12 68:15,18 75:8,16 76:1 tend 87:8 104:12 48:11,15 52:18 53:16 34:21 35:20,20,22 tended 13:3 54:10 55:11 59:13 76:4,14,15 77:4 78:5 59:10 68:2 82:14 tends 65:2 66:6 60:20 61:13 63:6,17 78:6,13,13 82:17,20 87:21,22 94:9 99:3 tenure 80:1 65:7 67:1,3 69:8,9 96:18 100:4,7 103:20 104:14,20 105:9,10 terms 24:4 25:21 26:4 70:2,7,12,18 71:12 106:4 107:16 110:1,8 107:18 109:6 114:13 35:6 36:15 37:18 73:5,9 74:7,10,17 112:3,8 113:4 114:12 123:7 130:21 132:11 59:14 63:7 75:1 76:13 75:1,8 76:7,12,12,13 125:16 129:17 131:4 136:6 137:20 138:9 82:3 92:14 94:19 76:20 78:21 79:15 133:11 136:6 142:5 138:15 140:19 141:10 112:12 143:8 80:22 81:9 82:19 142:12 143:4,10 **surprised** 127:19 testified 141:5 83:11 88:14,16 93:22 145:18 surroundings 135:12 testify 66:19 95:21 94:10 97:19 98:8 99:5 timeframe 14:4 113:6 99:11 102:4,6 103:5 **survey** 17:3 49:3 110:7 145:2 timeframes 13:14,15,16 suspect 23:6 testifying 22:12 104:1,5 105:5,14 14:2 24:5,14 38:5 **suspended** 33:10,17 testimony 4:14 7:7 14:8 106:9,14,16 109:5,8 timelines 38:21 sustained 116:12 15:2 28:22 29:11 109:14,15 111:20 timely 40:11 51:4 55:6 78:4 108:15 127:16 sworn 121:5 37:16 42:4,5,15 47:13 113:17 117:1 118:7 sympathetic 75:5 47:16 53:12 54:1 121:17 122:21 125:1 times 24:8,9 26:13 27:5 system 49:1 135:9 65:18 66:6 68:9 69:13 125:4,7,10,13,19 55:16 59:14 71:5 97:7 98:22 102:3 126:1,17 128:11,14 121:2,4 125:14 109:20 112:12 113:18 128:16 129:21 130:11 135:15 143:18 131:18 132:3,18 timing 103:12 table 5:7 25:10,12 30:9 30:11,14,16 72:2 text 73:1 133:8 134:3 135:8 Title 3:6,19 thank 5:10 14:6,12 22:3 136:18,22 137:1,3,7 93:22 139:10 today 2:6,18 4:19 5:16 22:4 23:22 28:19 137:16 138:2 139:2,6 14:22 15:11 21:5 22:9 tablecloth 7:21 29:17 30:22 31:1 39:4 139:10 140:9 144:19 take 3:5 26:16 32:7 36:7 68:22 78:22 82:12 59:9 81:10,11 84:22 145:10,11 113:7,18 142:18,20 48:15,17 68:18 73:15 94:16 95:5 96:13,14 **thinking** 39:12 40:18 144:9,13,14 73:15,20 78:4,6 100:19 107:6 109:9 96:15,17,19,21 97:21 42:2 told 37:4 66:17 thins 55:17 taken 20:11 31:12 33:7 98:19 109:18 119:13 tonight 66:19 34:7 43:6 47:14 66:19 119:19 121:10,11,13 **third** 51:13 **tool** 17:13 takes 58:12 61:11 68:15 121:15,19,20,22 thought 15:10 35:2,18 tools 69:22 70:18 122:2 128:7 132:20 36:1 39:22 42:1 48:9 top 106:12 132:14 109:6 116:7 129:22 138:5 145:1 talk 15:1 45:15,15 65:22 75:4 79:9 95:12 113:3 **topics** 31:3 **Thanks** 90:4 114:2 129:12 142:12 totally 115:14 138:13 66:14 72:19 91:14,17 thoughts 39:17 104:17 93:2 96:8 112:4 134:1 thin 67:7 touch 129:20 thing 15:1 18:3 21:12 136:12 threat 55:20 town 108:11 27:19 50:22 64:14 three 2:16 52:8 56:11 trace 23:18 talked 41:6 112:6 track 6:21 81:10 65:5 66:2,4 67:19 60:5 79:18 80:2.5.15 talking 25:22 42:17 68:6,8 73:4 77:11 95:14 106:18 107:1 trade 23:16 43:17 44:17 45:2 46:5 87:19 92:22 99:15 108:22 113:7,19 tradeoff 57:5 46:9 72:9 81:17 85:22 121:18 122:15 136:9 traditional 7:21 12:19 86:7 87:15,16 88:18 112:5 113:11,20

we've 13:22 24:5 33:13

44:5 trafficking 118:13,15 trained 101:17 120:11 training 143:3 transcript 110:2 trash 50:13 52:11 83:14 84:14 tremendous 76:14 trend 8:1 trial 70:22 71:18,19 tried 27:3 49:5 75:20 trip 108:11,11 troubling 135:14 true 62:5 81:20 truly 73:7 100:21 try 24:10 36:18 69:15 71:1 81:17.19 112:14 112:16 131:20 139:17 trying 26:2 28:9 34:18 35:8 42:21 57:22 58:1 74:9 77:7 78:19 94:18 96:3 100:9,11 101:20 101:21 130:12 131:18 134:18 138:9,14 139:7,8,11 143:5 tune 30:20 two 2:19 3:5,13 5:9 28:21 60:7 61:17 65:5 66:2,3 74:19 80:15 95:14 107:5 108:21 130:21 two-year 10:16,17 type 49:1 52:22 71:18 87:7 94:21 types 3:11 106:2 135:22

U

U.S 118:13 ultimate 20:10,11 42:8 44:12 **ultimately** 10:2 53:8 uncapped 25:5 uncomfortable 5:18 undercuts 115:18 underlying 115:17 116:13 underneath 106:11 understand 28:4,8,14 30:8 34:4 41:9 50:15 69:8 73:6 85:11 94:18 95:3 99:16 102:22 111:8 120:7 123:7 126:13 127:4 131:12 131:21 132:18 139:12 145:16 understanding 9:3 81:19 82:14 85:13

understood 39:3 79:16 91:21 138:4 139:8 144:11,15 unduly 65:1,2 **unfairly** 137:11 unfortunate 142:6 **Unfortunately** 138:8 universal 102:16 131:9 unlicensed 30:2 unnecessarily 131:5 unpleasant 106:2 unreasonable 24:15 unspecified 145:18 unstructured 110:14 updating 22:19 **upfront** 111:10 urban 109:1 urge 119:11 **urging** 118:19 use 19:1 27:20 28:2 47:6 55:13 101:10,15 106:20 useful 65:19 87:3,4 100:12 usefulness 40:5,16 usually 33:14 40:14

valid 116:20

49:17 121:3 142:5,9

valuable 17:13 58:4,7 72:10 75:19 value 42:5 51:16 52:14 55:5,5 57:12 61:13 72:10 74:13 92:12 135:11 values 50:12 85:8 variance 115:16 **varies** 32:1 variety 12:3 various 111:10 112:2 121:2 verify 27:16 versus 67:8 94:21 vice 29:14 video 131:2 view 15:10 16:21 94:20 113:6 126:6 violation 30:1 90:20 92:4,17 94:22 violation/no 92:4 violations 17:9 100:18 101:7 135:21 visits 100:3 120:19 121:1 135:13.17 volunteer 43:10 volunteers 130:8,9 133:12

voracity 83:5 **vote** 104:22 105:3

W wait 56:12 134:21 **waited** 66:18 **waiting** 66:13 waiver 20:9 walk 63:21 100:4 135:14 walked 62:15,15 Walker 4:17 want 2:4 6:8 13:5 24:12 27:21 36:18 39:8,14 45:18,19 47:18 48:13 49:11 59:1 60:10 64:12 66:1,3 67:4 69:6 73:13 75:7,7 81:17 89:6 102:12,20 107:13 109:16,19 121:14 122:2 127:22 130:15 133:18 137:7 141:3,18 142:2,3 144:9 145:5 wanted 6:7 70:11 109:22 113:5 122:7 132:21 133:2 136:12 136:22 142:19 wants 123:13 131:22 wary 70:9 **Washington** 1:12 7:14 wasn't 40:9 96:1 102:19 130:3 waste 67:21 wasteful 21:3 way 11:7,12 30:8 40:9 41:1,3 46:12 48:19 51:12,18 56:20 57:11 60:14 61:22 75:9 105:20 108:15 116:18 122:16 123:1 139:19 144:14 ways 37:6 69:10 we'll 14:13 22:5 69:19 71:14 91:17 111:4 114:16 134:10 144:8 we're 2:18 3:1 8:16 10:6 10:20 13:9 22:17 23:12,15 32:22 34:18 35:8 36:21,21 37:18 38:5,9,16 44:17 46:8 46:10 50:7,7 56:11 68:21 69:1 70:4 78:18 78:19 81:10,16 87:15 87:16,20 88:18 89:18 99:3 100:9 119:14

130:8,14 133:3,4,20

134:5,8,9 136:15

140:16 144:6

39:12 46:15 48:12 54:16 69:11 82:5 110:22 111:13 136:12 144:1 Web 13:1 week 81:4 130:20 weeks 56:12,12 103:14 113:7.19 weight 139:5,5 **Weiss** 5:2 welcome 2:4 went 63:9 95:14 121:4 white 7:21 23:13 134:14 137:9 who've 66:13 wholesale 23:16 wholesaler 23:10 29:19 29:22 30:5 wholesalers 5:4 22:15 29:16 widely 32:1 willing 62:9 114:8 willingness 65:16 wind 52:13 80:14 wine 30:12 wines 23:13 25:11 wish 4:10 21:6 59:21 99:1 111:7 withdrawn 13:11 34:3 36:6 witness 4:7 64:8 83:16 131:3 witnesses 4:4 7:7 54:19 58:16 64:5,9,13 65:4 65:22 67:13 75:1,2 83:13 107:16 wonder 32:5 wondered 79:18 wondering 39:17 128:8 **WOOD** 55:4 Woodson 5:1 14:14,15 14:17 22:22 31:5 39:7 39:8,9,21 42:2,20 43:12 44:8,15,20 46:2 46:21 47:12 48:2,4,6 49:2,5 50:20 52:9 53:13 54:7,12 55:1 57:4,10 58:19 59:10 60:12 61:2 62:8 64:15 65:10 67:10,16 68:2 71:15 72:4,7 75:17 76:22 77:2,16 79:21 80:19,22 81:7 82:2 83:22 84:2,4 85:1,7 85:16,17 87:6,17,21 89:7,12 90:5 91:1,8 91:11,20 92:6,11,18 96:4,17 110:17

101:18 110:13

	l	l
111:16 114:5 133:17	1:00 73:18	5
142:16,17	10 95:15 123:12	5 68:7
Woodson's 141:20	100 124:5	50 56:15
word 23:6 27:20 28:2	105 112:15	500 7:17
90:22 92:2,5 95:1	11 78:2	300 7.17
106:20 125:4	11-hour 43:8	6
words 27:15 91:4 108:5	12 95:15	
116:6 119:3	12-hour 43:8	60 74:14 143:13
work 14:4 41:6,15	12:54 145:21	600 105:1
55:15,22 58:8,10	13 1:9 2:6	
66:20 68:18 70:22	14th 1:11	7
	15 24:7 55:14 123:11	7 24:20,21
73:16 77:21 78:8,14		7:30 73:18
78:18	16 3:10	712.1 103:13,15
working 56:13 76:7	16.105.2 117:12	75 74:14
110:22	1602.5 104:18 105:17	7th 79:16
workload 77:17	1605 106:7 118:20	
works 14:5 93:20	1605.2 115:21 121:17	8
world 26:3	1605.3 107:9	8 8:14
worth 48:10 60:8	1612.2 104:19 106:5	800 7:14
worthy 53:17	17 56:4,8,19	330 7.14
wouldn't 44:22 75:4		9
92:16	2	
wrap 107:13,21 109:11	2 106:13	9:55 2:2
wrapping 90:9 107:22	20 55:15 121:1	90 40:12 59:16,16 60:1
write 99:5 126:19	2000 1:11	60:1 74:14,22 75:2
128:15 132:9	2004 125:20	90s 77:6
writing 115:22 144:7	2014 1:9 2:6 3:22	
written 4:15 14:7 15:2	21.1 24:21	
40:12 85:20 97:6	213.1 23:2,21 29:19	
98:22 102:3 113:17		
129:17	23 3:6,20 23:2,21 24:21 29:19	
wrong 82:19 93:22	25-102(a) 30:1	
wrote 42:3	25-211(b) 3:4	
	25.301 116:22	
<u>X</u>	25.601 116:14 125:21	
X 36:12 136:9	25601 105:7	
	25603 105:9	
Y	25608 105:10	
Y 36:12		
yeah 52:9 55:11 57:4	3	
62:7 107:18 130:18	3 68:6 95:17,22	
136:8	30 13:13 103:19 114:2	
year 54:17 110:22	121:1 123:12	
125:20	311 15:13 16:6 19:4,8	
years 8:21 14:21,21	21:2 44:21 45:11	
40:3 62:19 70:22 77:6	313 15:13 16:8 18:19	
77:22 79:2 99:19	42:11 51:1	
114:10	315 15:14 16:11 19:4,13	
	21:2 44:21,22	
	Z 1. Z TT. Z 1, Z Z	
Z 36:12	4	
zone 23:4 106:18	4 55:15	
	4:30 73:17	
0	40 56:15	
	45 13:12 24:7 122:14,19	
	-	
1	123:6	
<u>1</u> 1 5:1 68:5	123:6 45-day 108:9	
	123:6	